



# Proceedings of the 62nd ANNUAL CONVENTION

# NCAA

NEW YORK, NEW YORK / JANUARY 8-10, 1968

*Proceedings  
of the*  
**62nd Annual  
Convention**  
*of the*  
**National Collegiate  
Athletic Association**

**Biltmore Hotel  
New York, New York  
January 8-10, 1968**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### I. Register, 1968

Administrative Organization .....	5
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Press .....	7

### II. Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Convention

#### Opening Business Session

1. Opening Remarks .....	17
2. Convention Committees .....	18
3. Explanation of Voting Procedures .....	18
4. President's Remarks .....	19
5. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer .....	20
6. Report of the Executive Committee .....	22
7. Report of the Council .....	25
8. Report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions ....	30

#### Faculty Representatives—Athletic Directors Round Table

Proposals Concerning Football Practice .....	32
Current NCAA Position in the Amateur Athletic Dispute	38
Evaluation of the 1.600 Legislation .....	45

#### College Division Round Table

Opening Remarks .....	52
Problems of Dual Membership .....	53
Freshman Rule .....	57
Third Competitive Division .....	59
National Championships .....	63

#### Honors Luncheon

Introduction of Toastmaster .....	65
Introduction of Postgraduate Scholarship Winners.....	67
Introduction of Honored Businessmen .....	69
Presentation of Theodore Roosevelt Award .....	71

### Continuance of Business Session

9. Report of the Television Committee .....	77
---	----

#### 10. Proposed Amendments

Principles Governing Individual Eligibility .....	78
Membership Accreditation .....	78
Amendments .....	79
Transfers of Membership .....	80
Committees .....	80
Eligibility Rules for NCAA Events .....	81
Freshman Rule .....	82
Competitive Designation .....	86
1.600 Rule .....	87
Reconsideration of Amendments .....	98
NCAA Athletic Events .....	101
Extra Events .....	101
Preseason Football Practice .....	101

#### 11. Review of Interpretations

Professionalism .....	107
Eligibility Rules for NCAA Events .....	109
Limitations on Out-of-Season Practice .....	112
Eligibility Rules for NCAA Events .....	113

#### 12. Revisions in Executive Regulations .....

#### 13. Resolution

NCAA Council Statement .....	113
------------------------------	-----

#### 14. Report of the Committee on Committees .....

#### 15. Report of the Nominating Committee .....

### III. Appendices

A. Report of the Treasurer .....	116
B. NCAA Brief Before the Sports Arbitration Board .....	126



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION  
Midland Building Baltimore 1-7127

Kansas City, Missouri 64105

September 30, 1968

## 1968 N.C.A.A. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

### *President*

MARCUS L. PLANT, University of Michigan  
Professor of Law

### *Secretary-Treasurer*

ERNEST B. MCCOY, Pennsylvania State University  
Dean and Director of Athletics

### *Executive Director*

WALTER BYERS, Midland Building, Kansas City, Missouri

### *The Council*

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Nine members of the Council are the eight District Vice-Presidents and the Vice-President-at-Large each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately reelected for one additional term. Seven members are elected at-large for terms of three years and may not be reelected until three years have elapsed.

#### *Vice-Presidents*

District 1—Adolph W. Samborski, Harvard University  
Director of Athletics

District 2—Frank R. Carver, University of Pittsburgh  
Director of Athletics

District 3—H. Boyd McWhorter, University of Georgia  
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

District 4—James R. McCoy, Ohio State University  
Dean, College of Administrative Science

District 5—David Swank, University of Oklahoma  
Associate Professor of Law and Legal Counsel

District 6—J. William Davis, Texas Technological College  
Professor of Government

District 7—Milton F. Hartvigsen, Brigham Young University  
Dean, College of Physical Education

District 8—Bradford A. Booth, University of California, Los Angeles  
Chairman, Department of English

At-Large—Wilford H. Ketz, Union College (N.Y.)  
Chairman, Department of Physical Education and Athletics

## 1968 N.C.A.A. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

### *The Council (Continued)*

#### *Members-at-Large*

- Harry Arlanson, Tufts University  
Director of Physical Education and Athletics
- Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University  
Head, Department of Physical Education and Athletics
- Alan J. Chapman, Rice University  
Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
- Arthur W. Nebel, University of Missouri  
Dean, School of Social and Community Services
- Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
Professor of Education
- Arthur R. Reynolds, Colorado State College  
Dean of the Graduate School
- Marshall S. Turner, Jr., Johns Hopkins University  
Chairman, Department of Physical Education and Athletics

#### *Executive Committee*

*The NCAA President, Vice-President-at-Large and Secretary-Treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining seven members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year.*

- Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University  
Professor of Physical Education
- William J. Flynn, Boston College  
Director of Athletics
- Jesse T. Hill, University of Southern California  
Director of Athletics
- H. B. Lee, Kansas State University  
Director of Athletics
- Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa  
Dean, Division of Extension and University Services
- Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines  
Dean of Students
- James H. Weaver, Atlantic Coast Conference  
Commissioner

## SIXTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

### DELEGATES, VISITORS

#### Active Member Institutions

##### District One

- Amherst College: E. E. Richardson  
American International College: Joseph J. O'Grady  
Assumption College: Andrew Laska  
Bates College: Lloyd Lux  
Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields  
Boston College: William J. Flynn  
Boston, State College at: Peter Saitta, James P. Sullivan  
Boston University: Robert R. Peck, R. Victor Stout  
Bowdoin College: Daniel K. Stuckey  
Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis  
Bridgeport, University of: Herbert E. Glines, Francis Poisson  
Brown University: P. R. Theibert  
Central Connecticut State College: William M. Moore  
Clark University: Russ Granger  
Colby College: John W. Winkin  
Connecticut, University of: James B. Hickey, Robert Ingalls  
Dartmouth College: Seaver Peters  
Hartford, University of: A. Peter LoMaglio, Raymond Koch  
Harvard University: Adolph W. Samborski, Eric Cutler  
Holy Cross College: Vincent G. Dougherty  
Lowell Technological Institute: W. W. Yarnall  
Maine, University of: Harold S. Westerman, Stuart P. Haskell, Jr.  
Massachusetts, University of: Warren P. McGuirk, Robert W. O'Connell  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ross Jim Smith  
Middlebury College: Walter J. Nelson  
New Hampshire, University of: Andrew T. Mooradian  
Northeastern University: Herbert W. Gallagher, Joseph Zabilski  
Norwich University: Robert B. Priestley  
Providence College: Rev. A. B. Begley  
Rhode Island College: Bill Baird  
Salem State College: Richard L. Schneider  
Southern Connecticut State College: Jess Dow, Eugene Shelon  
Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz, Jon Foley  
Suffolk University: Charles Law  
Stonehill College: George Blaney  
Trinity College: Karl Kurth, Jr.  
Tufts University: Harry Arlanson  
United States Coast Guard Academy: Carl W. Selin  
Vermont, University of: J. Edward Donnelly, Roland D. Patzer  
Wesleyan University: H. G. McCurdy, Norman J. Daniels.  
Westfield State College: Paul Bogan

Williams College: Frank R. Thoms, Jr.  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert W. Pritchard  
Yale University: DeLaney Kiphuth, James G. Holgate

#### District Two

Adelphi University: James L. Bedell  
Albright College: Eugene L. Shirk  
Alfred University: James McLane  
Brooklyn College: Joseph M. Smith  
Bucknell University: Robert A. Latour  
Cheyney State College: Willard S. Jones  
City College of New York: Robert M. Behrman  
Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli  
Clarkson College: John Hantz  
Colgate University: Harold W. Lahar, Everett D. Barnes  
Columbia University: Leslie Thompson  
Cornell University: Robert J. Kane  
Delaware, University of: David M. Nelson, Raymond B. Duncan  
Delaware State College: James H. Williams  
Delaware Valley College: Ned A. Linta  
Dickinson College: David B. Eavenson  
Drexel Institute of Technology: John Semanik  
Duquesne University: Louis Skender  
East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler  
Elizabethtown College: John M. Tulley  
Fairleigh Dickinson University (Madison): Robert T. Shields  
Fairleigh Dickinson University (Rutherford): Harvey D. Woods  
Fordham University: John W. Bach, Keith G. Fleer  
Franklin and Marshall College: W. Roy Phillips  
Gannon College: Howard Elwell  
Georgetown University: John L. Hagerty  
Gettysburg College: Henry T. Bream  
Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia  
Hamilton College: Mox A. Weber  
Hampton Institute: Herman Neilson, Samuel McGhee  
Haverford College: Roy E. Randall  
Hobart College: William C. Stiles  
Hofstra University: Robert M. Getchell  
Howard University: Tillman R. Sease  
Hunter College: James Frank  
Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Charles Klausning  
Iona College: Howard J. Bulger  
Ithaca College: Carlton Wood  
Jersey City State College: Tom M. Gerrity  
Lafayette College: Olav Kollevoll  
LaSalle College: James J. Henry  
Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby  
Lincoln University: Manuel Rivero, Robert N. Gardner  
Long Island University: John Gray, William Lai  
Lycoming College: David G. Busey  
Montclair State College: W. P. Dioguard, Anthony R. Kuolt  
Moravian College: Harvey Gillespie, Rocco J. Calvo  
Morgan State College: Edward P. Hurt, Robert A. Smith  
Muhlenberg College: Raymond Whispell

New York University: Ben L. Carnevale  
Niagara University: John J. Gallagher  
Pennsylvania, University of: Fred A. Shabel  
PMC Colleges (Penn Military): George Hansell  
Pennsylvania State University: Ralph H. Wherry, Ernest B. McCoy,  
Edward Czekaj  
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure  
Pittsburgh, University of: Paul H. Masoner, Frank Carver  
C. W. Post College: Joseph Scanella  
Princeton University: R. Kenneth Fairman  
Queens College: Robert J. Tierney  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Henry W. Kumpf  
Rochester, University of: Robert J. Dewey  
Rider College: John B. Carpenter  
Rutgers University: Albert W. Twitchell, Kenneth G. Germann,  
Frederick E. Gruninger, Leslie Unger  
St. Francis College (Pa.): I. V. Davis  
St. John's University: Walter T. McLaughlin  
St. Joseph's College: Rev. Joseph M. Geib  
St. Lawrence University: Thomas A. Cartmill  
Seton Hall University: Rev. John J. Horgan  
Shippensburg State College: Thomas Crist  
Slippery Rock State College: Brad Keith, William C. Meise  
Scranton University: Rev. John P. McNicholas  
State University College, Brockport: A. H. Parker, Jr.  
State University College, Buffalo: Howard B. MacAdam, Fred J.  
Hartrick, Chet Palmer  
State University College, Cortland: Robert J. Weber, Roger I.  
Robinson, Tom Sullivan  
State University College, Geneseo: Robert F. Riedel, Daniel T. Mullin  
State University College, New Paltz: Loren D. Campbell  
State University College, Plattsburgh: Joseph C. Jastrab, Ernest P.  
Rangazas  
State University College, Potsdam: Sam Molnar  
State University of New York, Albany: John R. Tibbetts, Joseph  
Garcia, Alfred C. Werner  
State University of New York, Buffalo: James E. Peelle  
Swarthmore College: Willis J. Stetson  
Syracuse University: James H. Decker, Ferdinand A. Geiger  
Temple University: Ernest C. Casale, Gavin White, Jr.  
United States Merchant Marine Academy: James W. Liebertz  
United States Military Academy: Col. E. R. Heiberg, Jerry G. Capka  
United States Naval Academy: Capt. Alan R. Cameron  
Union College: Wilford H. Ketz  
Ursinus College: Everett M. Bailey  
Utica College: Eric H. Huggins  
Villanova University: Arthur L. Mahan  
Wagner College: Herbert E. Sutter  
West Chester State College: Bob Reese  
Wilkes College: Roland Schmidt

#### District Three

Alabama, University of: J. Jefferson Bennett, Jefferson J. Coleman,  
Charles J. Thornton

Alabama State College: C. Johnson Dunn  
 Alcorn A&M College: Marino H. Casem  
 Allen University: Thomas B. Nelson  
 American University: Anthony C. Morella, Robert H. Frailey  
 Auburn University: Charles F. Simmons, G. W. Beard  
 Austin Peay State University: Leon Bibb, Dave Aaron  
 Baltimore, University of: Arthur R. Bosley  
 Belmont Abbey College: Howard A. Wheeler  
 Benedict College: William Ward  
 Catholic University: E. R. LaFond  
 Citadel: D. S. McAlister, Eddie Teague  
 Clemson University: R. R. Ritchie  
 Chattanooga, University of: Thomas Geraghty  
 College of William and Mary: H. Lester Hooker, Jr.  
 Davidson College: Tom Scott  
 Duke University: Robert S. Rankin  
 East Carolina University: John O. Reynolds, Clarence Stasavich  
 East Tennessee State University: Solon Gentry  
 Eastern Kentucky University: Glenn Presnell  
 Elizabeth City State College: Robert L. Vaughan  
 Emory University: William C. Partin  
 Fayetteville State College: Harold L. Scott  
 Fisk University: H. B. Thompson  
 Florida, University of: Mandell Glicksberg, Percy Beard, Ray Graves,  
 Perry Moore  
 Florida State University: Vaughn Mancha, Robert C. Earnest  
 Furman University: J. Lyles Alley  
 Gallaudet College: Peter Wisher  
 George Washington University: Theodore P. Perros, Robert K. Faris  
 Georgia, University of: Joel Eaves, H. Boyd McWhorter  
 Georgia Institute of Technology: J. W. Mason, John McKenna  
 Grambling College: C. D. Henry, E. G. Robinson  
 Hampden-Sydney College: Dick Burrell  
 Johns Hopkins University: Marshall S. Turner, Jr.  
 Kentucky, University of: W. L. Matthews  
 Knoxville College: Julian Bell  
 Livingstone College: Walter E. Brown, Jr.  
 Louisiana State University: Harry Rabenhorst  
 Louisville, University of: Carl Abner, Bernard Hickman  
 Loyola College (Md.): Emil G. Reitz, Jr.  
 Maryland, University of: John E. Faber, W. W. Cobey  
 Maryville College: Howard Tomlinson  
 Memphis State University: R. M. Robison  
 Miami, University of: Edwin Duda, Charles M. Capps, Andrew F.  
 Gustafson  
 Middle Tennessee State University: Elbert K. Patty  
 Mississippi, University of: John R. Holley, John H. Vaught  
 Morehouse College: Frank L. Forbes  
 Mount St. Mary's College: John J. Dillon, Jr.  
 Nicholls State College: Ray Didier  
 Norfolk State College: William H. Wright  
 North Carolina A&T State University: Bill Bell, Artis P. Graves  
 North Carolina, University of: Walter Rabb, Carl S. Blyth  
 North Carolina College: James W. Younge

North Carolina State University: Ralph Fadum, Roy B. Clogston  
 Richmond, University of: R. C. McDanel, Frank Jones  
 Roanoke College: J. S. Hackman, Charles Moir  
 South, University of the: Walter Bryant  
 South Carolina, University of: James A. Morris, George J. Terry  
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Lloyd Milam, Reed Green  
 Southwestern at Memphis: William R. Maybry  
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: W. Drayton Lewis, A. G.  
 Urban  
 Tennessee, University of: Earl Ramer, Bob Woodruff  
 Tennessee A&I State University: Howard G. Gentry  
 Tennessee Technological University: R. Hooper Eblen, Flavious J.  
 Smith  
 Towson State College: Earl W. Killian  
 Tulane University: Hugh F. Rankin, Harvey M. Jessup, Rix N. Yard  
 Tuskegee Institute: Edward Jackson  
 Vanderbilt University: R. R. Purdy, Jess Neely  
 Virginia, University of: L. Starling Reid, Steve Sebo  
 Virginia Military Institute: C. L. Ellington  
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Wilson B. Bell, Jerry D. Claiborne,  
 Frank O. Moseley, William B. Matthews  
 Virginia State College (Petersburg): William B. Bradley, Thomas  
 Verdell  
 Wake Forest University: John W. Sawyer, G. Eugene Hooks, Jesse  
 I. Haddock  
 Washington College: Edward L. Athey  
 Washington and Lee University: Lee M. McLaughlin, Norman F.  
 Lord  
 West Virginia University: Ruel E. Foster, Robert N. Brown  
 Western Maryland College: James E. Robinson

#### District Four

Akron, University of: Kenneth Cochrane  
 Ashland College: George Donges  
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Lee Tressel  
 Ball State University: Philip E. Ballou, Bob Primmer  
 Beloit College: C. Von Eschen  
 Bowling Green State University: K. H. McFall, Doyt L. Perry  
 Butler University: James S. Hauss  
 Central State University: Gaston F. Lewis  
 Chicago, University of: Walter L. Hass, J. Kyle Anderson  
 College of Wooster: Robert M. Bruce  
 Dayton, University of: Harry Baujan, Thomas J. Frericks  
 Denison University: Roy Seils, Francis C. Bayley  
 DePauw University: James C. Loveless  
 Detroit, University of: Richard J. Perry  
 Eastern Michigan University: George W. Linn  
 Hope College: Gordon M. Brewer  
 Illinois, University of (Champaign): Leslie A. Bryan, E. E. Vance  
 Illinois, University of (Chicago Circle): Sheldon L. Fordham, Walter  
 G. Versen  
 Illinois State University: Milton E. Weisbecker  
 Indiana State University: Woodrow Suttle, Gordon H. Chalmers  
 Indiana University: Edwin H. Cady, Bill Orwig

Iowa, University of: Robert F. Ray  
 Kent State University: Carl E. Erickson, Walton D. Clarke  
 Knox College: Dean S. Trevor  
 Lake Forest College: Nick Wasyluk  
 MacMurray College: William L. Wall  
 Mankato State College: Robert J. Otto  
 Marquette University: Stanley Lowe  
 Marshall University: Harold L. Willey, Eddie Barrett  
 Miami University: Fred Cottrell, Richard G. Shrider  
 Michigan, University of: H. O. Crisler, Marcus L. Plant  
 Michigan State University: John Fuzak, Biggie Munn, Burt Smith  
 Minnesota, University of: Max O. Schultze, M. W. Ryman  
 Mount Union College: Jackson W. Rafeld  
 Muskingum College: Ed Sherman  
 Northern Illinois University: Frederick W. Rolf, Robert J. Brigham,  
 Robert W. Kahler, Nye L. LaBaw  
 Northwestern University: T. Leroy Martin, Tippy Dye  
 Notre Dame, University of: Ed Krause, Rev. Edmund Joyce  
 Oberlin College: Lysle K. Butler  
 Ohio State University: James R. McCoy, Richard C. Larkins  
 Ohio University: Fred Picard, William D. Rohr  
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Robert M. Strimer  
 Otterbein College: Robert Agler  
 Purdue University: Verne C. Freeman, Guy J. Mackey  
 St. Joseph's College: Richard F. Scharf, Thomas M. Ryan  
 St. Olaf College: A. C. Bundgaard  
 Toledo, University of: Vern Smith, Frank Lauterbur  
 Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig  
 Wabash College: Robert L. Henry  
 Wayne State University: Gerald E. Clark  
 Western Illinois University: Frank D. Sorenson  
 Western Michigan University: Albert Becker, Joseph T. Hoy  
 Wheaton College: Donald Boardman, Harvey C. Chrouser  
 Wisconsin, University of (Madison): Ivan B. Williamson, William  
 Aspinwall, O. C. Damman  
 Wisconsin, University of (Milwaukee): Herman Kluge  
 Wittenberg University: William M. Edwards  
 Xavier University: James J. McCafferty, Jack Cherry

#### District Five

Augustana College: Jim M. Malmquist  
 Bradley University: Orville Nothdurft, Charles Orsborn  
 Central Missouri State College: Floyd A. Walker  
 Cincinnati, University of: George D. Smith, Ralph C. Bursiek  
 Coe College: Glenn Drahn  
 Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn  
 Drake University: Jack McClelland, Leland P. Johnson  
 Iowa State University: Clay Stapleton, C. R. Bickerstaff, Harry  
 Burrell  
 Kansas, University of: Laurence C. Woodruff, Wade Stinson  
 Kansas State Teachers College: J. M. Pease  
 Kansas State University: H. B. Lee  
 Lincoln University: Dwight T. Reed, Arthur E. Pullam, Jr.  
 Morningside College: A. W. Buckingham

Missouri, University of (Columbia): Arthur W. Nebel, Dan Devine  
 North Dakota, University of: Harold Pedersen  
 North Dakota State University: R. G. Koppenhaver  
 North Texas State University: W. A. Miller, Jess Cearley, Winton  
 Noah  
 Northern Iowa, University of: James H. Witham  
 Northeast Missouri State College: John D. Black, James Dougherty  
 Oklahoma State University: Donald L. Cooper  
 Oklahoma, University of: David Swank, Gomer Jones, Ken Farris  
 Parsons College: Robert R. Meijer  
 South Dakota, University of: Wayne W. Gutzman, John Roning  
 South Dakota State University: Stanley J. Marshall  
 Southwest Missouri State College: Aldo Sebben  
 Tulsa, University of: John P. Dratz  
 Wichita State University: Frederick Sudermann

#### District Six

Abilene Christian College: Garvin Beauchamp  
 Arkansas, University of: John Kane, Bob Cheyne  
 Arkansas State University: J. A. Tomlinson  
 Baylor University: Monroe S. Carroll  
 Centenary College: Jack S. Wilkes  
 Houston, University of: Frank L. Stovall, Harry H. Fouke  
 Lamar State College of Technology: James B. Higgins, Jr.  
 New Mexico State University: Carl R. Hall  
 Pan American College: John W. Hook, J. A. Brooks  
 Rice University: Alan J. Chapman, Harold B. Hagan  
 Southern Methodist University: Harold Jeskey  
 Texas, University of (Arlington): Claude R. Gilstrap  
 Texas, University of (Austin): J. Neils Thompson, Orville Wyss,  
 Jack Patterson  
 Texas, University of (El Paso): Richard Burns, George C. McCarty  
 Texas Christian University: Kenneth W. Herrick, Abe Martin  
 Texas Technological University: J. William Davis, Polk Robison  
 Trinity University: Earl Gartman  
 West Texas State University: W. Mitchell Jones, Frank Kimbrough  
 Wiley College: J. Forrest Kelley

#### District Seven

Arizona, University of: Thomas L. Hall, M. R. Clausen, Frank W.  
 Soltys  
 Arizona State University: Clyde B. Smith  
 Brigham Young University: Floyd Millet, Milton V. Hartvigsen  
 Colorado State College: A. R. Reynolds, Joe Lindahl  
 Colorado State University: Harry E. Troxell, Thurman F. McGraw  
 Colorado School of Mines: Francis E. Smiley, Fritz Brennecke  
 Denver, University of: Hoyt Brawner  
 Idaho, University of: Roland O. Byers, Paul E. Ostyn  
 Idaho State University: Milton Holt  
 Montana, University of: Earl C. Lory, Walter C. Schwank  
 Montana State University: Harry G. Cockrum, Gene Bourdet  
 New Mexico, University of: Guido H. Daub, Pete McDavid  
 Southern Colorado State College: Houston C. Simms

United States Air Force Academy: Col. Frank Merritt, Charles W. Oliver, William T. Woodyard, Jack Schwall  
 Utah, University of: James R. Jack, Edward M. Jacobsen  
 Utah State University: Frank Williams  
 Weber State College: Reed K. Swenson  
 Western State College of Colorado: H. J. Dorricott  
 Wyoming, University of: Glenn J. Jacoby, Bill Young

#### District Eight

California, University of (Davis): William Lakie  
 California, University of (Berkeley): Peter Newell  
 California, University of (Los Angeles): Bradford A. Booth, J. D. Morgan  
 California, University of (Riverside): Franklin A. Lindeburg  
 California, University of (Santa Barbara): Andrew Everest  
 California State Polytechnic (Pomona): V. L. Gregory  
 California State Polytechnic (San Luis Obispo): Richard Anderson, J. R. Jones  
 California State College at Hayward: Lew Comer  
 California State College at Long Beach: Fred L. Miller, Clarence R. Bergland  
 California State College at Los Angeles: Cameron S. Deeds  
 Claremont Men's College: Bill Arce  
 Fresno State College: Cecil Coleman  
 Hawaii, University of: Robert M. Martin, Torlef Nelson  
 Oregon, University of: R. T. Ellickson, Len Casanova  
 Oregon State University: G. W. Holcomb, Kline Swygard, James G. Barratt  
 Pacific, University of the: Cedric W. Dempsey  
 Pomona College: Edward W. Malan  
 Portland, University of: Al Negratti  
 Portland State College: J. L. Gilmore, J. Neil Stahley  
 Sacramento State College: Merle A. Rousey  
 San Diego State College: Albert W. Olsen  
 San Fernando Valley State College: Glenn W. Arnett, Sam Win-ningham  
 San Francisco State College: Jerry Wyness  
 San Jose State College: Robert T. Bronzan  
 Southern California, University of: William C. Himstreet, Jesse T. Hill  
 Stanford University: Rixford K. Snyder, Robert G. Young  
 Washington, University of: Harry M. Cross, James D. Owens  
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Stan Bates

#### Allied Members

Athletic Association of Western Universities: Thomas J. Hamilton  
 Atlantic Coast Conference: James H. Weaver, Eugene F. Corrigan  
 Big Eight Conference: Wayne Duke, John Waldorf  
 Big Sky Athletic Conference: Jack Friel  
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Richard A. Anderson  
 Central Collegiate Conference: Stanley Lowe  
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: William T. Johns  
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Asa S. Bushnell, George L. Shiebler, Robert M. Whitelaw, William L. Rothenberg

Gulf States Conference: Stanley Galloway  
 Interstate Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Dempsey E. Reid, Harry Fritz  
 Intercollegiate (Big Ten) Conference: William R. Reed, John Dewey  
 Ivy Basketball League: Irving F. Smith  
 Mid-American Athletic Conference: Robert C. James, R. D. Peck, Jr.  
 Middle Atlantic Conference: Willis J. Stetson  
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: C. Von Eschen  
 Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Roy F. Brown  
 Missouri Valley Conference: Norvall Neve  
 New England College Athletic Conference: Herbert W. Gallagher  
 North-East Collegiate Basketball League: Joseph Scanella  
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Albert N. Smith  
 Ohio Valley Conference: Arthur L. Guepe  
 Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: H. B. Kniseley  
 Southeastern Conference: A. M. Coleman, Cliff Harper  
 Southern Conference: John O. Reynolds, Lloyd P. Jordan, J. Dallas Shirley  
 Southwest Conference: Howard Grubbs, Wilbur Evans, Cliff Speegle  
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Ivan Kingsley  
 Western Athletic Conference: Alfred Thomas, Paul W. Brechler  
 Yankee Conference: J. W. Christian

#### Affiliated Members

College Swimming Coaches Association of America: Ted Webster  
 National Athletic Trainers Association: William E. Newell

#### Visitors

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions  
 Officers: Ken Vickery  
 Athletic Journal: Charlie Thorp  
 Baptist College: Howard Bagwell  
 Bluebonnet Bowl: Lou Hassell  
 Football Publications: Lois Friddell  
 Gator Bowl Association: Nelson M. Harris, Jr., George R. Olsen  
 Junior Rose Bowl: Gary Dorn, John Nicholl, Mike Ward  
 Liberty Bowl: A. F. "Bud" Dudley  
 Marvin Sugarman, Inc.: Marvin Sugarman  
 Memphis Memorial Stadium: T. J. Foley, Jr., Hal Lewis  
 Miles College: B. T. Harvey  
 Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing: Wally Benson  
 NCAA Official Film Service: Richard S. Snider  
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary  
 National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations: Clifford B. Fagan  
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Harvey Harman, Chester J. LaRoche  
 New Orleans Mid-Winter Sports Association: Bernie J. Grenrod, Claude "Monk" Simons, Fred J. Wolfe  
 Orange Bowl Committee: B. Boyd Benjamin, James L. Llewellyn, John Ring, C. Jackson Baldwin  
 Ronald Press Company: Howard A. Hobson

Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association: H. W. Bragg, Raymond Dorn, Stanley Hahn, Bill Leishman, Lay Leishman, William Nicholas

Sacred Heart University: Don Feeley  
South Alabama, University of: Michael Livingston, Mel Lucas  
Spencer Advertising Company: George Faherty  
Sun Bowl: Harrison D. Kohl  
Tel Ra Productions: W. Wallace Orr, Jr.  
U. S. State Department: Asbury "Red" Coward  
Washburn University: Mike Sarkesian

### Working Press

Arizona Star: Abe Chanin  
Associated Press: Will Grimsley  
Atlanta Journal: Furman Bisher  
Bloomington Herald-Telephone: Bob Owens  
Cleveland Plain Dealer: Ed Chay  
Collegiate Baseball: Lou Pavlovich  
Detroit News: Larry Middlemas  
Kansas City Star: Bill Sims  
Knoxville News-Sentinel: Tom Siler  
Memphis Press-Scimitar: Buck Patton  
Minneapolis Tribune: Sid Hartman  
Nashville Banner: Fred Russell  
Newsday: George Vecsey  
New York Daily News: Larry Cox  
New York Times: Dave Anderson, Gordon S. White, Jr.  
Pasadena Star-News: Joe Hendrickson  
Philadelphia Enquirer: Frank Dolson  
Transglobal News Service: Mark Koenigil  
Tucson Citizen: Carl Porter  
United Press International: Steve Smilanich

## OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

Monday, January 8, 1968

The opening session was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by the President of the Association, Marcus L. Plant of the University of Michigan.

### 1. OPENING REMARKS

**President Plant:** Gentlemen, it is my honor and privilege to welcome you to the 62nd annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. I hope the warmth of the welcome that I extend to you is not diminished by the temperature that prevails in this area. We have a Committee on Weather, but it does not seem to function very well except in California.

I hope you have not been unduly chilled by what I am sure you have observed, the slight readjustment of the registration fee. This establishes that the NCAA is in keeping with the times. Ticket prices are going up, food prices are going up and we would be out of step if we did not follow along.

I have experienced a great many satisfactions in serving this year as your president. I think the most important one has been the good fortune that has come to me; that I have been able to meet many more of you personally than I would have had, had I not been honored with this office.

The most impressive satisfaction has been the enthusiasm and the willingness of the membership of this Association to devote time, effort and energy to its work. I have had occasion to ask a good many of you to do jobs that take time, that consume energy and that are somewhat tedious and I have not been turned down once since last January, but rather cheerful acceptances. I have been connected with some other organizations in which I have had the task of asking people to do work, but in none of them have I had the responsiveness that I have observed in this organization. Not only are the people willing to do the work, but they are able to do it. The two do not always go together. But so far as the NCAA activities are concerned, there has been a happy combination of those two qualities.

The greatest burden of the Association's work has fallen upon the members of the Council and the Executive Committee. These are the men to whom we turn initially and often for explanation, study and recommendations on our problems. (President Plant then introduced the members of the Council and Executive Committee.)

I want to refer to the fact that Samuel E. Barnes of Howard University, a member-at-large of the Council, is not here. Some of the members of Sam's family were involved in an automobile accident and he feels it advisable to be with them. We have him in our thoughts and send our best wishes to him.

I also want to observe that Bernie Shively was one of the most

active, devoted and energetic members of the Executive Committee. Everyone who knew him, or knew his work, regarded him with deep respect. Those who knew him personally had deep affection for him and it is saddening to take cognizance of the fact his name will be on the list to be read later by the Committee on Memorial Resolutions.

There is another gentleman on the platform whom I wish to introduce. I could introduce him in several capacities. He is Chairman of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and a member of the Infractions Committee, but he is here today as parliamentarian; Harry M. Cross of the University of Washington.

It is also fitting that we publicly acknowledge the tremendous job that is done by the staff in Kansas City. I will mention the staff in New York City again in another connection. I will not mention them individually, but I will say that they are faithful and conscientious and also have the happy faculty of being able to do what they undertake. They deserve a great deal of commendation from the entire Association.

## 2. CONVENTION COMMITTEES

Now let me refer to some of the committees appointed for this convention. There are three changes to which I wish to refer.

First, there are two changes in the Nominating Committee. In District 5, Maurice Soult, Iowa State University, is unable to be here, and Laurence Woodruff of the University of Kansas has been substituted.

The at-large delegate, Robley C. Williams, University of California, Berkeley, was unable to be present and Rixford K. Snyder, Stanford University, will serve in his place.

There is one change in the Committee on Voting. Rex Grossart, representing District 8, is unable to be here and in his place, Cameron S. Deeds, California State College at Los Angeles, will serve.

## 3. EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURES

First, the members of the Association are entitled to vote. Each active member and each allied member has one vote. Members are entitled to have more than one representative, but the voting delegate has a white badge and the alternate delegate has a blue badge. If the voting delegate is on hand he shall cast the vote. In his absence the alternate is entitled to vote.

Visitors have pink badges and members of the press have gold-enrod badges.

On matters related to the Constitution a two-thirds vote is required and the Chair must determine there has been the proper number of votes. We will have standing votes and the Voting Committee will make the count.

On matters not requiring a two-thirds vote, but only a simple majority, we will have a voice vote. If the Chair is in doubt, he will ask for a standing vote. If the Chair is in doubt on the standing vote, he will call for a roll-call vote.

I have been told there may be those who will desire a written ballot. We are prepared to try to handle that, although that is a difficult vote to handle. It is not out of order to make a motion to have one and the Executive Committee has determined that if such a motion is made, it must be approved by a majority vote. That

will be a standing vote or a voice vote, but a written vote is not necessarily precluded. It is thought, however, by some that the roll-call vote is probably the most accurate and secure.

The question of a written vote may be raised any time such a vote is desired.

I will now ask Professor Cross to explain the amending procedure under the Constitution and Bylaws provisions of our Association.

**Harry M. Cross** (University of Washington and Parliamentarian):

There are provisions in both the Constitution and the Bylaws for amending. The basic provision is a matter of protection for all member institutions; that adequate notice of the proposed amendment must be given in order for it to be considered at the Convention. The amendment is transmitted in writing by the body proposing it to the executive office and is then sent out in the Official Notice.

Amendments to amendments must be prepared in writing and submitted before one o'clock on the second day of the Convention.

There is a limitation of the privilege of proposing an amendment to the amendment. The amendment to the amendment cannot propose a change more extensive than the amendment itself proposes. If such possibility does exist, the Chair will have to rule whether it is beyond the permissible change in which case it then cannot be considered.

There are two situations where there is printed the proposed amendment which appeared in the Official Notice and also an additional amendment. The additional amendments did not go through the normal procedures and therefore must be treated as amendments to the original amendments, that is, the amendments which appeared in the Official Notice.

An amendment to an amendment, whether of the Constitution or the Bylaws, can be adopted by a simple majority vote. If the amendment to the amendment is adopted, the particular amendment to the Constitution can be adopted only by a two-thirds vote and an amendment to the Bylaws by a majority vote.

## 4. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

**President Plant:** This has been a great year for the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The membership is now at an all-time high of 691 members.

The public is interested in our affairs, particularly in programs which we present. This year there was a record football attendance. More people are attending intercollegiate athletic contests generally and in 1967 the 610 four-year colleges playing intercollegiate football had an all-time record attendance of 26,430,000. So we are the subject of not only public interest, but public support.

I want to call your attention to the NCAA News. This paper has recently been expanded and is now being published on a monthly basis. The content is becoming more interesting with each issue and I hope you will read and absorb it. If you have not received the latest copy, they are available at the registration table. It is our hope that this will become the definitive source of amateur sports information in the United States.

I shall make just one or two remarks about the differences that

have existed between our Association, the United States Track and Field Federation and the Amateur Athletic Union.

We have worked very earnestly during the past year with the Sports Arbitration Board which was appointed by Vice-President Humphrey. As you may recall, some time ago we offered to arbitrate all issues if the other side would submit all issues to arbitration, but our offer was refused. We have observed the moratorium asked for by the Senate Resolution and by Senator Magnuson. We have observed the moratorium meticulously in the face, I might say, of repeated violations by the other side. We are disheartened actually by this milieu. On the one hand, we have somewhat honeyed words in the meetings, but rather eccentric declarations of ineligibility when we are outside the meeting room.

The Amateur Athletic Union, as far as we can see, holds that no one can put on a track and field meet without its permission. This is accomplished by saying on meetings, open or closed; depending upon what the categories are, the sanctions must be maintained. This is and will continue to be totally unacceptable to us.

The reports of the vice-presidents and of the rules and tournaments committees are in the 1966-67 Annual Reports. I hope you will read them. They contain a great deal of interesting and provocative information.

I will now move to the first part of the agenda; the Report of the Secretary-Treasurer which will be presented by Ernest McCoy of Pennsylvania State University.

#### 5. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

**Ernest B. McCoy** (Pennsylvania State University): The financial report for the period September 1, 1966, through August 31, 1967, is based on the audit submitted by Francis A. Wright and Company of Kansas City, Missouri. Included is the audit of the accounts of the National Collegiate Athletic Bureau, prepared by Steinberg, Sands and Stone of New York City and a report on the financial operations of the College Athletics Publishing Service by K. E. Mackey and Company, Phoenix, Arizona.

Details of the financial reports are included in your Convention Program, pages 45 to 54. The Association continues to be in a strong financial position. Current assets were increased from \$301,554.53 to \$573,451.26 during the fiscal year ended August 31, 1967. Most of this increase appeared in the cash total. This is primarily due to the fact that \$200,000 worth of short-term bonds matured during the month of August prior to the completion of the audit and is reflected as cash on hand for 1967 while carried as investments in the audit completed in August, 1966. This is also the primary reason for the substantial reduction in investments.

There is also a reduction in current liabilities, principally due to handling Olympic contributions directly through Olympic House rather than through the Association's executive office.

Total reserves have increased from \$903,470.00 in 1966 to \$1,040,375.00 as of August 31, 1967. During the past year the Executive Committee created additional reserve funds including an Advisory Trust Reserve for investment purposes with the City National Bank of Kansas City.

The Association's general income for the fiscal year amounted to

\$526,388, an increase of \$116,000. The most financially successful National Collegiate Basketball Championship in the Association's history and the success of other NCAA events is primarily responsible for the increased income.

General expenses for the fiscal year amounted to \$385,286.55. This represents an increase of \$19,000 over the previous year and reflects the expanding operation of the Association.

The reserves of the Association are listed in two categories: the Funded Cash Reserve and the Investment Trust Account.

The Funded Cash Reserve is covered in full by cash or immediately marketable securities. These funds amount to \$192,237.43.

The Investment Trust Account, consisting of government securities, corporation stocks and corporate bonds, amounts to \$326,802.97. (The financial report is included in Appendix A, pages 116-125.)

As has been pointed out by our President, during the calendar year of 1967 the Association's membership continued to increase and reached an all-time high of 691 members. This includes 603 active members, 41 allied conferences, 26 associate institutions and 21 affiliated organizations.

New members during the past year include:

#### Active

##### District 1

Bryant College, Providence, Rhode Island  
Bentley College, Boston, Massachusetts  
New Haven College, West Haven, Connecticut  
Fitchburg State College, Fitchburg, Massachusetts  
Gorham State College, Gorham, Maine  
Lyndon State College, Lyndon Center, Vermont  
North Adams State College, North Adams, Massachusetts  
Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhode Island  
Ricker College, Houlton, Maine  
Eastern Connecticut State College, Willimantic, Connecticut  
Worcester State College, Worcester, Massachusetts  
Salem State College, Salem, Massachusetts  
St. Francis College, Biddeford, Maine

##### District 2

Monmouth College, West Long Branch, New Jersey  
Utica College of Syracuse University, Utica, New York  
Clarion State College, Clarion, Pennsylvania

##### District 3

Florida Presbyterian College, St. Petersburg, Florida

##### District 4

Winona State College, Winona, Minnesota  
Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan  
Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Michigan

##### District 5

Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa

##### District 8

University of California, Irvine, California  
Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington  
College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho

### Associate

Florissant Valley Community College, St. Louis, Missouri  
Miami Dade Junior College South, Miami, Florida  
Community College of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Penn.  
University of Missouri at St. Louis  
Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, Oklahoma  
Southwest Minnesota State College, Marshall, Minnesota  
Yampa Valley College, Steamboat Springs, Colorado

### Allied

Southwestern Athletic Conference.

Mr. President, this concludes the report of the Secretary-Treasurer and I move that it be received. (The motion was seconded and approved.)

## 6. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**William J. Flynn** (Boston College): One of the major projects considered during the past year was the reorganization of the Association's Service Bureau in New York City. Last January, the Executive Committee reported on the division of duties of the National Collegiate Athletic Bureau with the statistical service remaining in New York City while the publishing service was moved to Phoenix, Arizona, and renamed the College Athletics Publishing Service.

The NCAB has been renamed National Collegiate Sports Services. The primary purpose of the reorganization of the service bureau was to expand the Association's promotion and public relations efforts in New York City, the communications center of the nation. Wiles Hallock relinquished his duties in the Association's executive office as public relations director and has moved to New York to assume the position of director of the National Collegiate Sports Services and will devote his primary attention to the promotion of intercollegiate sports.

Tom Hansen has been appointed as the Association's Public Relations Director. Tom was formerly with the Athletic Association of Western Universities. It also is the intention of the Association to expand its overall public relations and publications efforts and in this regard the NCAA News has become a monthly publication.

Included in the reorganization was the establishment of the new position of business manager. Art Bergstrom has assumed these duties and will supervise budgetary and financial matters. Warren Brown becomes responsible for the Association's certification program which includes extra events, summer baseball and high school all-star games.

Through this reorganization the Executive Committee hopes to further promote intercollegiate athletics, establish close contact with the nation's wire services and radio and television networks, improve our public relations program and follow sound business procedures in the handling of the Association's financial affairs.

As usual, the Executive Committee concerned itself with matters related to the Association's meets and tournaments. This past year, however, there was considerable discussion concerning the sport

of gymnastics and the National Collegiate Gymnastics Championships.

There is a substantial difference of opinion as to whether the trampoline event should be continued as part of the National Collegiate Gymnastics Championships. Some areas of the country are most vocal in wanting the event eliminated while others reflect a strong desire to retain the event. The Executive Committee is divided on the fate of the trampoline. Consequently, the Executive Committee authorized a joint committee, composed of representatives of both the Executive Committee and the Gymnastics Rules and Meet Committee to give further consideration to this problem. The sub-committee will conduct a survey of those institutions that sponsor gymnastics on an intercollegiate basis and hopefully will report its recommendations to the Executive Committee next spring.

The Executive Committee also approved a new format for the National Collegiate Gymnastics Championships. There was considerable criticism of the previous format, especially from athletic directors, that the number of competitors and teams qualifying for the finals must be controlled. As a result of the recent change, six conference championships and two regional meets, conducted for those institutions which do not belong to one of the six conferences, will be used to qualify teams and athletes for the National Collegiate Championships. Also, the top three individuals per event in the regionals also will qualify for the finals of the National Collegiate Gymnastics Championships. Finally, the international compulsory exercises were added to the 1968 schedule of events.

To aid the Gymnastics Rules and Meet Committee in its deliberations and to lend assistance and administrative guidance in the conduct of its business, the Executive Committee has proposed an amendment to the Bylaws which increases the size of the Committee from six to seven members, with the stipulation that one committee member must be a director of athletics.

Also approved was the new format for the National Collegiate Basketball Championship, effective with the 1969 tournament. The new format calls for the regionals and the finals tournaments to be played on Thursday and Saturday rather than the traditional Friday-Saturday format. Your Executive Committee believes that the new format will provide greater preparation time for the coaches involved, give more rest to the players, allow for better press coverage and coincide with the recommendations of the United States Basketball Writers Association, eliminate conflicts with high school tournaments and coincide with the scheduling of the National Association of Basketball Coaches Convention.

The Executive Committee also approved a format change for the National Collegiate Golf Championships. Commencing with the 1968 tournament, the team championship will be determined over 72 holes instead of 36. All but the low 15 teams and ties will be eliminated from the team competition after 36 holes. Also, only the low 32 individual medalists will play the final 36 holes to determine the individual champion.

As a result of Convention action last year, a special mail referendum was conducted to authorize the Association to sponsor a National College Division Baseball Championship in 1968. The referendum was passed overwhelmingly and the first National College

Division Baseball Championship will be conducted at Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield, Missouri, June 5-8. An amendment will be brought to the attention of the membership at this Convention authorizing the establishment of a National College Division Baseball Championship on a permanent basis.

We also should note that the First Annual National College Division Gymnastics Championships will be conducted at Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts, March 7-9. This brings to nine the total of national championship events conducted expressly for the Association's College Division members.

The Executive Committee is studying the possibility of increasing the number of NCAA championship events. There appears to be support for NCAA-sponsored competition in the sports of water polo, lacrosse and volleyball. Past history indicates that the establishment of an NCAA championship in a sport definitely helps to popularize that sport. Soccer is a prime example.

The American Football Coaches Association's Board of Trustees recommended to the Executive Committee that the NCAA establish a National Collegiate Football Championship. Undoubtedly most of you have read statements and articles, pro and con, concerning the establishment of national championship competition in the sport of football. There are National Collegiate Championships in four team sports at the present time. The Executive Committee authorized the President of the Association to appoint a special committee to study the feasibility of NCAA-sponsored football competition.

The Constitution authorizes the Executive Committee to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution and Bylaws. Certain revisions were made during the past year, primarily in financial procedures concerning meets and tournaments. These revisions may be noted on pages 39-43 of the Program. They are designed to provide more orderly procedures for an institution serving as host to an NCAA championship event. Also, you will note that an institution which uses its facilities in serving as host to an NCAA national championship event may retain two per cent of the net receipts as an administrative fee in reimbursement for miscellaneous expenses not otherwise covered in the financial report. Also, if an institution incurs a deficit in the conduct of a National Collegiate Championship event, the Association will absorb the cost of individual and team awards.

In other matters, not necessarily related to meets and tournaments, the Association has entered into an agreement with a new organization called the NCAA Official Film Service. The film service will have exclusive film rights to NCAA championship events and also will produce promotional and instructional films under the official NCAA label. Through this arrangement there will be greater exposure given to NCAA events. Also, by utilizing the tremendous talents of NCAA coaches and athletes, instructional films will be developed to assist other coaches and physical education teachers from elementary school on up. There is, surprisingly, a shortage of good, well-produced sports films. NCAA Official Films hopes to fill that void.

To assist some of the Association's affiliated coaches' associations, the Executive Committee authorized grants totaling \$15,500. The

money was advanced with the stipulation that the particular coaches' association would use the revenue to promote its particular sport and/or its organization.

The Executive Committee recommended the establishment of a special committee to study preseason football practice with the idea of providing additional practice time in the interest of safety and to arrange an equitable number of practice sessions for all members, taking into account the variance in academic calendars. We are pleased to note that the committee has been at work and has proposed an amendment for consideration at this Convention.

The Executive Committee also has sponsored amendments to Article 9 of both the Constitution and Bylaws, changing the dates for submitting and circularizing amendments. The present time schedule is just too demanding and a number of conferences have requested an opportunity to view the proposed amendments prior to their December meetings.

Next year, gentlemen, the 1969 NCAA Convention will be conducted at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles, California, January 6-8. The 1970 Convention is scheduled for Washington, D. C.

Through the course of the year, the Executive Committee has received reports from President Plant and others concerning the activities of the Sports Arbitration Board and matters pertaining to the Federation Movement. Inasmuch as this area will be covered in detail elsewhere, it is sufficient to state that the Executive Committee believes more than ever that it is essential and progressive to support the Federation Movement.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I wish to conclude by thanking you for your continued cooperation in promoting the NCAA program and making the Executive Committee's work easier. Mr. President, I move that the report of the Executive Committee be accepted and approved, including the detailed accounting of our activities as circularized in the Annual Reports and the revised Executive Regulations as set forth in the Convention Program on pages 39-43. (The motion was seconded and approved.)

## 7. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

**Arthur W. Nebel** (University of Missouri): The NCAA Constitution commits to the Council the establishment and direction of the general policies of the Association in the interim between Conventions.

A record of the Council's proceedings during the year may be found in the Annual Reports.

We have devoted considerable time and attention to Bylaw 4-6-(b), commonly referred to as the 1.600 legislation. It was the focal point of attention at last year's Convention and appears to be of prime interest to the delegates gathered here. The subject has been discussed from coast to coast by educators, athletic officials and sports columnists and an evaluation of the legislation is scheduled for the Round Table program this afternoon. It appears that 1.600 now enjoys almost as much notoriety as was attached to 3.2 during my younger days.

While there is an acknowledged difference of opinion as to whether the rule should apply to all or just some of the membership, there

is virtually unanimous agreement that its intent is noble. The idea of establishing an academic floor for financial aid and eligibility has received the endorsement of the Council from the beginning. True, there has been a difference of opinion among Council members as to certain details of the legislation, but the overwhelming majority of the Council strongly supports the legislation and the amendment which bears the Council's name.

Sometimes, gentlemen, I believe we tend to forget the basic purpose of the legislation, which is actually very simple. The legislation is based upon the proposition that if an NCAA member is to compete with its sister institutions for what presumably is the highest intercollegiate attainment in a particular sport, the National Collegiate Championship, then its student-athletes should be representative of the male student population of that institution and at least a minimum level of continuing academic attainment should be required.

Based upon the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements, which has devoted many long hours of study to this area, the Council has resisted any change in Bylaw 4-6-(b) since its enactment two years ago. The Council agreed with the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements that the effect of both phases of the rule, paragraphs (1) and (2), should be judged and, for many members, paragraph (2) had its first application with the current academic year.

Both the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements and the Association's Council now believe that an adjustment should be made in paragraph (2) to accommodate the legitimate concerns expressed by a number of member institutions which follow selective admissions procedures. In addition, the Council believes that paragraph (1) should be strengthened for administrative reasons.

As a result, the Council is sponsoring an amendment to Bylaw 4-6-(b) which appears on page 28 of the Convention Program. The Council hopes you will study it thoroughly, discuss it at the Round Table and in your district meetings and support the amendment at Wednesday's business session.

For the second consecutive year, the Council is recommending a change in the enforcement policies and procedures of this Association. In 1967, the Convention amended its penalty structure to fix responsibility for violations on the head coach or head coach and other coaches involved. The membership agreed that if an institution is found guilty of substantial violations of NCAA rules and regulations and if the institution does not take appropriate disciplinary action against the coach involved, the institution may be required to show cause why its membership in the NCAA should not be suspended or terminated.

During the current year, the Council reactivated the Penalty Review Committee to study a revision in the enforcement program through the inclusion of a statement to indicate that students knowingly involved in flagrant violations will be held responsible for their actions and may jeopardize their intercollegiate athletic eligibility through such involvement.

Consequently, the Council is asking your support of a change in the enforcement procedure so that all principal parties involved in a violation may be subject to NCAA disciplinary action; the in-

stitution, the coach, and the student-athlete. It is anticipated that if this legislation is adopted, the Council will administer it carefully and judiciously.

To further educate those closely involved in recruiting, the Council is sending representatives to appear before the various coaches' associations to better inform them of the enforcement policy and procedures of the NCAA. President Plant is scheduled to address the American Football Coaches Association later this week. Secretary-Treasurer McCoy will appear on the program of the National Association of Basketball Coaches in Los Angeles.

This past year, the Council was confronted with several cases involving student-athletes who competed in organized basketball competition during the summer. The legislation prohibiting participation in organized out-of-season basketball competition was first adopted in January, 1962. Presumably, all members are aware of the rule. Hopefully the faculty athletic representatives and athletic directors here will remind their basketball coaches to caution their athletes not to compete in organized out-of-season basketball competition. Otherwise, their future eligibility for intercollegiate basketball is in jeopardy. If you or your coach have any questions about what is considered to be an organized league, please do not hesitate to contact the Association's executive office for advice.

There has been increasing interest in the possibility of foreign basketball competition for NCAA members, both at home and abroad. Undoubtedly this was stimulated by the International Basketball Federation's decision which enabled the Basketball Federation of the United States of America to arrange and sanction competition for its members independently and without interference from any other organization. In fact, we have been involved in more international basketball competition as a result of the Federation's activities in 1965, 1966 and 1967 than in all the previous 30 years of international basketball.

When the international basketball body (FIBA) met in Uruguay last summer, it was informed by the United States representative, the AAU, that the Basketball Federation represented only about 30 per cent of organized basketball competition in the United States. Let me remind you that the constituency of the Basketball Federation includes the NCAA, National Junior College Athletic Association and the high schools which, in actuality, represent almost all amateur basketball in this country. The AAU informed FIBA that it would not interfere with the Basketball Federation's program of foreign competition. Upon return to the United States, however, the AAU served notice that it alone would arrange and sanction foreign competition despite its earlier pledges to FIBA.

The Basketball Federation will not submit to this oppression. It has taken the firm position that foreign competition, both at home and abroad, must be sanctioned by the Basketball Federation. The reasons for this position were detailed earlier in a report to membership and in the NCAA NEWS.

As a result, the Council urges members of the Association not to engage in foreign competition unless the specific arrangements are approved and sanctioned by the Basketball Federation. Further, the Council will not approve out-of-season basketball tours in foreign countries without Basketball Federation approval and sanction.

Significantly, the International Amateur Basketball Federation has informed the AAU that it must unify all amateur basketball interests in the United States and improve its administration of the sport by October, 1968, or FIBA will investigate the matter directly and the AAU's membership in the international body may be in jeopardy.

It has become obvious to those of us who have served on the Council for a period of time that there is considerable dissatisfaction with the AAU's administration of athletics. The United States Gymnastics Federation seems to be progressing most satisfactorily. The International Gymnastics Federation recently approved a tour of this country by a Scandinavian all-star group including athletes from Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. The tour is arranged and sanctioned strictly by the USGF and has the support of the international body.

There also is unrest in the sport of wrestling. Although it is still in the embryonic stages, it is apparent that the leaders in the sport believe that a federation should be created if wrestling is to grow and prosper.

The Council has followed closely the proceedings of the Sports Arbitration Board in attempting to find a solution to the Track and Field dispute. I will not dwell upon this in detail inasmuch as a discussion of this problem is scheduled for the Round Table this afternoon and the NCAA's final summation before the Sports Arbitration Board is elucidated in an excellent manner by the Association's legal counsel on page 69 of the Program. I should emphasize, however, that the NCAA position is the same as it has been from the outset. It is simple and direct:

1. We are irrevocably committed to ending the AAU's monopoly control over track and field competition in the United States. This is a monopoly which competent legal counsel advises is in violation of laws of this land.

2. In breaking this absolute control we have in mind the permanent termination of such AAU policies and practices which in essence say:

**Policy:** There can be no American track competition without AAU consent either in the form of an AAU sanction or an AAU decision to call the competition "closed" on the basis of a definition exclusively determined by the AAU on a case-by-case basis.

**Policy:** Only the AAU shall determine which athletes may go abroad, regardless of what the competition might be and which coaches may accompany the athletes.

**Practice:** Using its international authority to bully the U. S. Olympic Committee into doing what the AAU dictates.

**Practice:** Denying educational organizations administrative authority which they should have and must exercise as a part of accepted educational responsibility.

3. We are committed to supplying our support in all ways possible to a single-purpose track and field organization which can do the most for the development and expansion of the sport in the United States.

I also would like to call your attention to the report of the NCAA Olympic Committee which appears on page 65 of the Program. For

several years we have listened to the Association's Olympic delegates voice concern as to the organization and direction of the United States Olympic Committee. Apparently, the situation has not improved, in fact, it appears to have worsened. Bill Reed's report should be required reading for all delegates attending this Convention.

While in the area of international athletic competition, I should tell you that the Council is encouraged with the possibilities offered by the Association's involvement in the United States Collegiate Sports Council. The USCSC was organized to accept this country's franchise for World University Games competition. Joining the NCAA are other organizations interested in and connected with intercollegiate athletics. United States participation in future World University Games competition will be planned and arranged through the USCSC. If you are not familiar with the World University Games, it is competition of the highest caliber which is organized for college and university students throughout the world. Those who are much more knowledgeable than I express the opinion that the World University Games are destined to become the most prestigious international competition outside of the Olympic Games. United States' participation in World University Games competition has been on a limited basis thus far, but hopefully with the formation of the USCSC a full complement of coaches and athletes will be sent to future competitions.

In view of the fact that the two previous Conventions have defeated Council proposals for the enactment of summer camp legislation, the Council has decided to reserve its "third swing" for another day. Hopefully some of you will review the revisions presented last year. Some members have voiced suspicion of new summer camp legislation fearing that it would be more restrictive. Let me remind you that the intent of the proposals previously submitted was to encourage wider use of college facilities, staff and athletes in the summer camp movement. It is the opinion of the Council that the membership can make a substantial contribution in this area. This is an appeal to you to submit any suggestions and ideas you may have that will enable the Association to consider new legislation and interpretations to allow our members to become more involved in this type of activity without violating amateur and recruiting rules.

The NCAA Television Committee has successfully concluded negotiations with the American Broadcasting Company for the 1968 and 1969 football seasons. Several new innovations were added which have been designed to promote college football. The new television plan, which was approved by the membership, provides for a "wild card" game that should be of considerable appeal to the football fan.

As college enrollments continue to grow, many institutions have fostered club competition in certain sports. Consequently, the question was raised as to whether or not a club team is eligible for NCAA competition. The Council has ruled that to enter an NCAA championship event, a student-athlete or team must be recognized by the institution's administration as participating in an intercollegiate activity and such activity must be administered by the department of athletics. Also, the eligibility of the student-athletes

involved must be attested to by the regular institutional eligibility authority.

The final item in my report concerns a subject which is always well received at a stag affair—women. All of us are aware of women's important role in our way of life. They now are becoming more interested in intercollegiate athletics. NCAA championship events are limited to male students. Also, the Association's rules and regulations governing recruiting, financial aid and eligibility apply only to the male student.

It was recently brought to the Council's attention that an increasing number of NCAA institutions are sponsoring intercollegiate athletic activities for women. Some of these institutions have sought the advice of the Association as to the proper administrative procedures for an intercollegiate program for female students.

As a result, the Council has appointed a committee to study the feasibility of establishing appropriate machinery to provide for supervision and administration of women's intercollegiate athletics. Let me say now, before there is any misinterpretation of the Council's action, the committee appointed is strictly a study group and includes among its membership some of the leaders of the division of girl's and women's sports of AAHPER. This should not be misconstrued as an effort on the part of the NCAA to establish women's championships or extend present Association regulations to women's intercollegiate programs. It is possible that this may be the eventual result. It is important to stress again, however, that at the present time the Council is merely investigating this matter with the intent of obtaining additional information and of making a future report to the membership.

It has been a most interesting and rewarding experience for me to serve on the NCAA Council. One cannot help but be impressed by the dedication of your elected Council representatives and I speak particularly of our president and secretary-treasurer. Also, I have been continually amazed at the growth and potential of intercollegiate athletics. You have heard it said before and I believe it is worth repeating: The school-college program is the backbone of athletics in this country. We have a great program, gentlemen. Let us protect it, nourish it, and stimulate it so that it may reach its maximum potential within the educational framework.

Mr. President, I move that this report of the Council be received. (The motion was seconded and approved.)

**President Plant:** I now call for the report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions by the Rev. Aloysius B. Begley.

#### 8. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

**Rev. Aloysius B. Begley** (Providence College): The Committee on Memorial Resolutions wishes at this time to present the following resolution:

*Be It Resolved*, that we, the delegates to the 62nd Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, pay sincere and heartfelt tribute to the following members of our Association who dedicated their lives to the betterment of youth and the cause of intercollegiate athletics and who have been called from this world since our last national convention.

I will now ask Everett Barnes to read the necrology.

**Everett D. Barnes** (Colgate University): It is with deep regret that your Committee on Memorial Resolutions presents this necrology to you.

Benson, James, Johns Hopkins University  
Bly, James, Duke University  
Cissell, Kermit, University of Maryland  
Collier, William, Southeastern Conference  
Corbett, James J., Louisiana State University  
Crawford, H. I., North Carolina State University  
Daniel, Robert P., president, Virginia State College  
Duncan, Ray O., West Virginia University  
Edman, V. R., Wheaton College  
Gerstung, Fred, Wheaton College  
Gladchuk, Chester, University of Massachusetts  
Green, V. J., Drake University  
Greene, Theodore E., Oklahoma State University  
Hill, Glenn A., North Dakota State University  
Jeremiah, Ed, Dartmouth College  
Johns, Wilbur, University of California, Los Angeles  
Julian, Alvin, Dartmouth College  
Keaney, Frank, University of Rhode Island  
LaPointe, Ralph, University of Vermont  
Lowry, Howard F., College of Wooster  
McEwen, Robert W., Hamilton College  
McGrane, Robert P., King's College  
McKale, James F., University of Arizona  
Moore, Bernie H., Southeastern Conference  
Movern, John J., Georgetown University  
Perkins, Donald C., Chapman College  
Quinn, Lyle T., Iowa State High School Athletic Association  
Shively, Bernie A., University of Kentucky  
Snygg, Donald, State University College, Oswego, New York  
Saunders, William H., Knox College  
Sponaugle, S. Woodrow, Franklin and Marshall College  
Storer, William H., Slippery Rock State College  
Thorner, Guy C., Oberlin College  
Walton, A. C., Knox College.

**Reverend Begley:** *And Be It Further Resolved*, that this expression of our esteem and sympathy be extended by the officers of the Association to the families of our former colleagues with the assurance that their memory and their contributions are esteemed and valued.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of these resolutions.

**President Plant:** May we manifest our acceptance of the resolution and our respect for the men named and our affection for them by rising for a moment of silence. (The assembly rose and observed one moment of silence in tribute to its deceased members.)

(The Convention recessed at 11:55 a.m.)

## COMBINED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS ROUND TABLE

Monday Afternoon, January 9, 1968

The session convened at 2:00 p.m., Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University and Secretary of the Association, presiding.

**Chairman McCoy:** We are gathered here this afternoon as a combined group of athletic directors and faculty representatives and we will attempt to cover three very important areas.

### Proposals Concerning Spring and Fall Football Practice

**David Nelson** (University of Delaware): During the past two or three years there has been considerable discussion about the present football practice rule and there has been an NCAA committee appointed to develop an amendment to the Bylaws for extending fall football practice. However, there are some other proposals that go beyond the appointing of a committee and among these are some of the considerations we would like to put before you today.

Examples of these are the extension of fall and spring football practice, the elimination of spring football practice, the permission to allow institutions to engage in intercollegiate contests during the spring and also the establishment of an early training period before the start of the fall football practice.

We have on our panel today Harry Arlanson of Tufts University, who will introduce the subject and the various ideas of starting fall football practice; Carl Blyth, who will talk on the possible abolition of spring football practice; Frank Carver, who will talk on spring games and scrimmages with other institutions during that part of the year; John Pont, who will talk on the implementing of the starting date of fall practice; and Dave Swank, who will talk on the needs for balancing the physical training period early in the fall with the prohibition of pads and body contact work.

**Harry Arlanson** (Tufts University): My purpose is to speak for a special committee that was established by the officers following the last convention with the charge that we might come out with a starting date for football that would be acceptable to the membership and also that consideration of safety would be included in any such proposal that we might establish.

Just to let you know who the members of this committee are, let me say they are Ken Rawlinson of Oklahoma; Carl Blyth, University of North Carolina; Dr. Paul of the University of Iowa; Ed Bogeny of the University of Texas; Dan Devine of the University of Missouri; myself; and Bill Reed of the Big Ten as chairman.

If you recall the discussion at the last convention, there were three proposals made, none of which seemed to be acceptable, but there were two factors that were brought out: (1) There wasn't sufficient time in the present legislation; and (2) there was concern for safety in the early preseason practice.

I invite you to look at pages 30 and 31 of the Program. Proposal A on page 30 is not the final thinking of this committee. Through an error in communication the correct proposal was not placed in the Official Notice. That has since been resolved and in your Program the correct one is Proposal B. That is the proposal to which I would like to speak at this time.

In connection with this particular proposal, I would have you refer to pages 32 and 33 where you will see charts that extend calendars through the year 2000, if you can picture such a time. Apparently in the matter of scheduling football teams there is no limit to how far ahead you make the schedule.

We propose to amend Bylaw 8-1-(a) to read as follows:

"(a) A member institution may elect any one of the following for its first preseason practice in football in any year and shall not commence practice prior to the date so elected:

"(1) The nineteenth day before its first scheduled intercollegiate game; or

"(2) The 22nd day before the next-to-last Saturday in September; or

"(3) That date which will permit a maximum of 29 'practice opportunities' prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate game. (In determining the number of 'practice opportunities,' Sundays will be excluded from the counting, but otherwise there shall be counted (a) one for each day beginning with the opening of classes, (b) one for each day classes are not in session in the week of the first scheduled intercollegiate game and (c) two for each other day in the preseason practice period.)

"Physical activity during the first three days of the preseason practice period shall be limited to non-contact conditioning drills. No football gear or protective equipment other than headgear, shoes and porous, light-weight jerseys and pants shall be worn by players during practice sessions in this three-day period."

This proposal attempts a kind of uniformity in preseason practice which is not allowed by calendar fluctuations in opening practice at a specified calendar date such as September 1 in the present rule. In other words, we couldn't find any correlation in setting up a certain date as the starting point.

The proposal is based upon the concept that an ideal preseason practice period is of three weeks duration, the first two of which would consist of twice daily practice sessions. The third week, or week of the opening game, shall consist of once daily practice sessions.

The Committee felt that two weeks of double sessions and a single week before the opening game would be sufficient.

I can think of no better case than my own situation at Tufts. We have an eight-game schedule and we always play the last Saturday in September. This year the last Saturday of September was on the thirtieth. We practiced 30 days and classes didn't start until September 19. I will tell you, frankly, our coach was quite concerned as to how he was going to keep the morale of the boys up before our first game came along. So I think you can overdo the preseason practice.

To this end, it is provided that practice may begin 19 days before the first scheduled game. This permits the ideal practice period described above, unless academic calendars are such that there cannot be two weeks of twice daily sessions, which is taken care of by sub-paragraph (3).

Under the present rule, those institutions opening on the first allowable Saturday or Friday now have a maximum of 16 days.

This can result in a full additional week of practice and the benefit of experience in one game for the school opening its playing season on the earliest possible date as against another school which opens its season the following week.

To reduce this discrepancy Proposal B provides that the school opening its season a week or more later than the earliest opening date for play may conduct practices for a period somewhat greater than the ideal three-week format. In effect, the week's difference is split.

The next to the last Saturday in September is selected as the base because it is the date on which the vast majority of the colleges open their playing season.

As noted earlier, the opening day of classes may affect the ideal practice period under either of the foregoing options since the date may be such as to preclude 22 days of practice in which twice-daily sessions can be held. In any such case, the equivalent of the ideal practice period is assured as the third option; that is, if (a) and (b) do not fit your particular institution because of variable calendars, the opening day of classes and the fluctuation when you start your opening game, then part (c) would apply in your case.

This is assured through the stipulation permitting 29 practice opportunities which are determined by a formula used to count the days before the opening game on a basis which provides the same number of practice opportunities as exist in the ideal three-week practice period.

Also provided by this proposal is that the first three days of the preseason practice period shall be devoted to noncontact conditioning drills.

**Mr. Nelson:** Dave Swank of Oklahoma will discuss the need for establishing a physical training period early in the fall with the prohibition of pads and contact work.

**David Swank** (University of Oklahoma): I wondered why they asked a lawyer to talk about the need of conditioning exercises and I thought perhaps it was because of an idea of compromise.

I have found most of the doctors, physicians and team trainers would like to have five to seven days, maybe even ten days, of physical conditioning. They say this is the way to get the young men acclimated to the heat and insure proper physical conditioning.

Obviously, we cannot have the optimum there, so I think we have what seems to be an excellent compromise.

The purpose of these three days of non-contact training is, first, to acclimate the individual.

The second is to insure more uniform physical conditioning of each athlete. Our doctors and team trainers say 50 per cent of the men coming back each fall are ready to play. Sixty-five or 75 or 90 per cent of the men come back in excellent physical condition. But it is that per cent which does not come back in good physical

condition which makes necessary such a rule as we have proposed.

In studies conducted by the NCAA during the past ten years, it has been established that 50 per cent of the football injuries occur during the first three weeks of practice.

Heat injuries or heat stress injuries and lack of acclimatization occur within the first two weeks, or during the time of two-a-day practices. There is a belief that many of these injuries not due to physical contact themselves, may be eliminated. In other words, if your athlete is better conditioned; if he has been acclimated to the heat; he is not going to suffer the heat stress injury and the possibility of other injuries may be lessened.

The American Medical Association has recommended that a proposal such as we have before us be implemented by college and high school athletic bodies. I think about 50 per cent of the high school athletic associations in the United States today have adopted such a rule. This has been adopted in Oklahoma and I believe most of the Southern states have adopted this type of legislation. It has been found to be very effective in preventing the death of young athletes due to heat stress and improper conditioning.

The American Football Coaches Association survey has resulted in a recommendation in favor of the same type of legislation.

**Mr. Nelson:** The third area concerning the starting date for fall practice will be discussed by John Pont of the University of Indiana; implementing the starting date of the fall practice.

**John Pont** (Indiana University): By and large, most people feel that two weeks of preseason football practice is not enough time. A great many of the injuries are the result of the fast pace on the part of the coaches to prepare their teams by September 15. Naturally, we cannot properly schedule that well. Schedules are already made, as was mentioned, in 1970, 1978 and 1980.

Three weeks is really the optimum time for practice before the first game in all aspects, both mental and physical. We are concerned more with the physical because a year ago we started on the fourteenth to fifteenth and we had more injuries than this year. Where we had no injuries early in the season we credit this to an increase in practice time. Two years ago we had two weeks' practice.

I was a little worried about the three days of practice without pads. After thinking about it we felt this would be a very, very wise thing to do. I hope you will not go to ten days for another factor other than physical; the well being of the young men. When we start giving ten days of preparation to these young men, you are going to discourage working during the summer months. If we don't put some responsibility on the young men, if we just make rules and say, "Come back and we will work ten days with you," we are taking something away from the game of football.

**Mr. Nelson:** Related to the early starting dates and also the establishment of periods of training without pads are the spring football sessions. Carl Blyth of the University of North Carolina will discuss "Abolishing Spring Football."

**Carl Blyth** (University of North Carolina): I offered this topic to several other members of the panel, but you can see what resulted. I want you to understand that if I thought any of the opinions expressed by me would be detrimental to college football, I would not have accepted this assignment under any circumstances.

So it seems necessary that we consider spring football practice in light of its role in college training.

In my search for an equitable date for the opening of football practice, I frequently heard the term "quality practice." Since this was a new term to me, I sought out the definition. It was defined as a practice held when school was not in session. It was further stated that an athlete could learn more and progress more rapidly without the worry of academic pressure. If it is true that football activity can be assimilated more actively or completely without academic pressure, would not one then expect that academic assimilation would be greater without the increased burden of football preparation and year-long football preparation?

Another reason to consider the abolition of spring practice is academic eligibility, which of course includes entrance requirements in all institutions represented here, remaining in school, the demands of the school and the academic demands placed upon all students.

Everyone present is well aware of the increased academic pressures in our institutions and we are also increasing the football pressures.

Stating it simply, we are encroaching too much on the student-athlete's time and we are in some instances preventing him from achieving the academic excellence of which he is capable.

I realize there are many of you who feel that spring football practice is necessary in order to exercise and experiment with your personnel for the next football season and further you feel that college football may decline in its caliber and excellence if spring practice is abolished.

For those of you who feel that the decline of college football will result if we abolish spring football practice, we suggest that we get an extra week of practice in the fall, thereby gaining 12 quality practices without being interfered with by quality education. I suggest that we keep quality football in the fall of the year, and let the students at least enjoy the benefits provided in the academic field in the spring.

**Mr. Nelson:** At the other end of the board on spring training or practice is the idea that we should be allowed to have spring games or scrimmages with other institutions. Frank Carver of the University of Pittsburgh will speak to that point.

**Frank Carver** (University of Pittsburgh): I don't think I could be much further away from Dr. Blyth, but I am not going to belabor the point very long with you. I would just ask you to think for a minute about the possibility. Here we have a game, football, which is an intercollegiate program and we have the intercollegiate institutions of the country limiting it.

If we ease the restrictions on intercollegiate competition during the spring to permit, at the end of the spring drill, a controlled, and I emphasize controlled, scrimmage game with one neighboring institution, preferably one you do not meet during the regular season, it would be a much more meaningful spring practice.

If we are in contention with professional athletics the year round, it would increase the number of exposures to college football. At one time I was a publicity man with the job of writing about college football and between New Year's Day and the start of the season

there are not many opportunities for publicity. If during the spring we had one controlled scrimmage game to compare Institution X with Y, it couldn't hurt anything.

**Mr. Nelson:** The meeting is now open for questions from the floor.

**Harold W. Lahar** (Colgate University): Regarding the starting date of football practice, is it the intention of the committee that no institution should have less than two weeks of double sessions? Do you think that is in the best interest of the game?

**Mr. Arlanson:** I think you have to understand that you cannot answer every situation ideally, because of three variables involved. We did mention the ideal, the two weeks of double sessions. Obviously, John Pont feels that possibly you can get along with less. If you get two full weeks of double sessions that is the maximum. Now, how much less you can get by with is questionable.

Those of us who coach football know it is very important to have the double sessions. It was not the purpose of the committee to cut down in any way, but to try to make this whole proposition as equitable as possible.

**Mr. Lahar:** Well, it can be resolved in a general situation. You can schedule earlier, but many of us are going to a much earlier starting date for classes and it means we may have to move the schedules back with it. The further back we move it, the more we will reduce the double sessions, which I think is a handicap. I don't know whether anyone will agree with that, but I would oppose it on that principle.

If we could state that we would not deprive anyone of two weeks of double sessions, I think it would be better.

**Col. E. R. Heiberg** (U. S. Military Academy): I would like to address myself to the question of two weeks of double sessions. We start our school on the day after Labor Day. This year that is going to be the third of September and with the 29-session deal it is impossible to have two weeks of double sessions before classes start. And from that time on, we get a one-session day or only part of an afternoon.

I would like to see that portion of the previous rule kept, which was that "Preseason practice in football shall not begin prior to September one of each year, or prior to two weeks before the first day of classes, or 16 days before the first scheduled intercollegiate game, whichever is earliest."

**Mr. Lahar:** I believe the statement was made that a student-athlete has a better opportunity to perform academically when there are no football practice sessions and has a better opportunity to perform in football when there are no classes in session?

**Mr. Blyth:** In essence the idea is there, but I tried to say it differently.

**Mr. Lahar:** For those who do not have spring practice, if you can conduct a double-session on those days that classes are not in session, are we being fair to the student-athlete by asking him to prepare for the season in single-session days while classes are in session?

**Mr. Blyth:** All I can say is you have more days and more practice sessions than you had last year.

**Mr. Lahar:** The proposal you advocate is very good, except I don't think you can deprive any institution from having two weeks of

two-a-day drills, because there is a definite advantage in two sessions a day when classes are not in session.

**Francis E. Smiley** (Colorado School of Mines): I would be glad to see spring football abandoned and was a little bit dismayed to see a proposal for its extension. Would you plan that these would be regular games with gate receipts to help pay for the additional expense?

Secondly, was there any study made on the cost of spring practice, since we are talking so much today about the expanding cost of athletics?

**Mr. Carver:** To my knowledge, no study was made of the cost of spring practice.

It is my idea that the game would be at the end of the spring drills and I would anticipate a nominal admission charge. It would not be a game, however, it would be a very tightly-controlled scrimmage session.

**Rix N. Yard** (Tulane University): I would like to say that since the New Orleans Saints moved into our town we have to conduct our football program the best way we can. I think the ability to publicize our program in the spring through a scrimmage with an opponent would be very, very helpful.

**Mr. Nelson:** Mr. Chairman, I think this concludes this program. Thank you very much for your interest and attention.

**Chairman McCoy:** I think we all recognize the fact that we never can get rid of the problem of equitable practice periods for everybody with the various schedules that we have in our many, many institutions.

#### **The Current NCAA Position in the Amateur Sports Dispute**

**Marcus L. Plant** (University of Michigan): Last January I went home from Houston riding on a cloud, as you might imagine, and spent a very happy two weeks. This happiness, calm and general enjoyment were shattered quite sharply by the information that athletes had been declared ineligible because of their participation in the U. S. Track and Field Federation Track Meet which was held in the early part of February at Madison Square Garden and that five athletes had been declared ineligible for having participated in the gymnastics meet at Pennsylvania State University against a team representing Cologne University of France.

I had thought there was a moratorium and after consulting with those who had had more experience in the actual battlefield operation than I, I discovered that the moratorium has been deteriorating for some time.

The present phase of the track and field dispute goes back to the sessions with the United States Senate Commerce Committee in the month of August, 1965. Eppy Barnes was NCAA president at that time and was one of the witnesses at that session and he will have more to say about it.

Suffice it for my purposes to say that at that time a moratorium was presumably established, the essence of which, as we saw it, was that there would be no action taken during the period of the moratorium to restrict competition by athletes or to keep athletes out of competition. Pursuant to that moratorium and our agreement to be bound by it and comply with it, the NCAA voluntarily

suspended Bylaw 7-B and 7-C which, in effect, say that athletes from our institutions may not participate in meets unless they have been sanctioned by the appropriate federation.

The Vice-President of the United States appointed a Sports Arbitration Board, consisting of five people. It has since been reduced to four.

We immediately filed a protest against the action which declared these athletes ineligible with Mr. Theodore Kheel, who is a famous mediator of labor disputes here in New York, and who has had a great deal of experience in this field. No action was taken. There was a meeting of the Arbitration Board scheduled in the early part of May, 1967. The gymnasts had been declared ineligible, so Ernie McCoy and the gymnasts, themselves, asked for a special hearing before this Board, although this Board was really set up for the track and field dispute. This was the main target of the Senate's attention. Nevertheless, we asked for a hearing, they all appeared and the case was explored.

The AAU took the view that this meet was such that although all the people involved were students, it was a meet that required their sanction and that they had been directed by the international body to take this action. That is to say, in order to comply with their obligations to the international body, they had to take the action.

We found out later on that the international body had not had anything to do with the suspension; it was purely an AAU move and four of the gymnasts were ultimately restored to eligibility at the request of Mr. Kheel, although that came very late in the season. One of them has never had his eligibility restored. The athletes declared ineligible because of participation in the USTFF meet were restored. I am not quite sure what compelled the Board to do it. I am not sure whether it was our pressure or the pressure from the Vice-President's office. At any rate, the AAU did do it.

This is the sort of situation that has existed since the beginning of 1967 and perhaps shortly before that.

The arbitration proceedings have not made a great deal of progress, at least in the normal sense that an arbitration should make progress.

The technique of the Board has been to mediate. I am sure you are all familiar with this, but let me just mention that the mediation proceeding is one in which the neutral party or the government agent keeps the individuals talking with each other, doesn't let them freeze their positions to the point where they won't mediate, just keeps them talking and ultimately brings them or makes it easy for them to get together.

A typical example of mediation was the subway dispute. There the city was offering, if I read the papers correctly, the subway workers \$35,000,000 and the subway workers were demanding \$100,000,000 in the package. As a result of the mediation the city gave \$70,000,000 and the subway workers accepted that.

This process works quite successfully in labor disputes, because you have a great deal of pressure on each side to settle it. The industry has to start production soon and the workers have to start paying their bills or the strike fund runs out or whatever it may be, so there is a great deal of pressure to come together.

That type of pressure does not exist in the situation in which we are and for that reason the mediation proceeding has not been suc-

cessful. We go into the meetings and begin to talk and we come out of the meetings and we haven't gotten very far at all, except to exchange conversation and dispute with each other.

As an arbitration proceeding, this is not entirely satisfactory as far as we are concerned for this reason. Since the Board has been operating, the issues to be arbitrated have never been identified.

The usual procedure in arbitration is that the arbitrator identifies the issues that are going to be decided and the parties agree that when he decides them they will abide by his decision. The issues to be arbitrated have never been decided and we have asked repeatedly that the issues be identified, and the only response is, "that will be taken up," or "we will decide all issues," but neither side has agreed to arbitrate all issues.

The NCAA made an initial agreement when the dispute started that we would submit all issues to arbitration if the AAU would. In this letter of presumable agreement to Senator Magnuson, the AAU withheld some very important issues from arbitration, so as an arbitration proceeding it is, to say the least, unconventional. It is also I think without any legal authority. The resolution under which the Board is operating is not a public law. It is set up by a Senate resolution and this will not do much more than it says; that is, it is the sense of the Senate that this proceeding should be had. There is no public law or Congressional act behind it. Neither party has agreed in the sense that they could become bound to the operation of some arbitration statute such as exists in the State of New York and in many other states.

It is I think pretty clear from the statements that were made by Mr. Kheel to the Senate Committee in August of 1967 that he understands this and realizes the only force behind any decision he might make or the Board might make would be the force of public opinion or such political force as might be mustered by one means or another.

There was the track meet in February, the gymnastics meet and the meet at Albuquerque, New Mexico, in June, at which another example of capricious declaration of ineligibility appeared. The meet was not sanctioned by the AAU, but the AAU picked out seven Iowa high school girls and declared them ineligible, allowing quite a few other important athletes whom they have use for in international competition to retain their eligibility. So it is a pretty clear case of selectivity.

There has been another development in the form of the introduction of three bills into Congress by Senator James B. Pearson of Kansas. Of course, he has been very interested in this whole matter and has a very broad-gauge view of it.

One of the measures that has been introduced by Senator Pearson is one we would not be interested in. It would create a board which would have arbitration powers created by the Congress. The Board would decide the dispute and remain in force for 60 days after the decision was handed down, and after 60 days, with no court action the Board would disappear.

The second one would create a sort of government bureau to handle the problem. I don't think anyone seriously wants that.

The third one would be the creation of a new organization; that is, it would foster the creation, it would bring it into life much the way the U. S. Olympic Committee was brought into life by a Con-

gressional Act, but the Government would not be in control of it. It does appear it would be a democratically-oriented organization in the sense that interested parties would have a fair vote in all matters and would participate in the decisions at the policy meetings.

When Senator Pearson asked that there be hearings on that bill, which is in the Judiciary Committee, Senator Magnuson reconvened the Commerce Committee, called in Mr. Kheel and the Board and asked the NCAA and USTFF to participate, of course. By this time, the U. S. Track and Field Federation had been recognized as a separate and independent party, and representatives of that organization were there. Of course the AAU was represented during the two days of hearings. It appears clear that Mr. Kheel recognizes that there is no legal basis for any decision he might make in the sense of power, but that its influence would only be that of public opinion or political weight.

When the hearings concluded at the end of August, it was suggested by the senators that a decision be reached within 60 days but several things prevented this. For one thing, this Board has never rushed into action. Secondly, Professor Cox of the Harvard Law School, was at that time engaged in mediating the teachers' strike in New York so we held "final hearings" in California on November 10. Since then we have had no more hearings. We have filed a brief which contains an excellent statement of our position, prepared by Phil Brown, our counsel in Washington. (See Appendix B, pages 126-132.)

That is the posture of the arbitration right now. We do not know when the decision will come down. We were told that it would be sometime after the first of the year, but no specific time was mentioned.

Meanwhile, the Council has continued not to enforce Bylaw 7-B and 7-C. There have been a great many suggestions come to the Council from knowledgeable sources that perhaps it would be appropriate at this time to announce that those Bylaws are going to be enforced and the enforcement will start at a specific date, something like December 1, 1968, which would take into account the Olympic situation.

The situation is current and fluid, however. You will recall the U. S. Track and Field Federation indoor meet will be held in New York City soon, and there may be a repetition of the events that occurred last year.

Furthermore, a Scandinavian team is coming to Pennsylvania State University to engage in gymnastic meets, and there are already signs the AAU is taking action to interfere or harass the participants in that meet. So it isn't quite letting down, and we don't think it is likely to do so.

**Everett D. Barnes** (Colgate University): Mr. Chairman and Delegates: Mark Plant has brought you up to date on the status of the controversy, and I would like to try to bridge the gap a little to tell you how we arrived where we are. I am not going to delve into history to any great extent, but I will briefly touch some of the highlights; then Bob Ray will discuss the solution which we have offered. If these presentations solicit some question, we will answer them.

Many of you remember the famous Ross Smith Resolution, passed

by the 1965 NCAA Convention, "that the National Collegiate Athletic Association by direct communication invite the Amateur Athletic Union to participate in negotiations directed toward the formulation of a plan to achieve cooperative sanction and certification of open competition at the domestic level."

We had four rapid and succinct meetings with the AAU, trying to accomplish the charge of the mandate and were unsuccessful in doing so. As a result, it was decided to petition the President of the United States to appoint an Arbitration Board of nonpartisan citizens who were knowledgeable, and we did commit ourselves to abide by the decisions of the Arbitration Board and consider them binding, however as Marcus has pointed out, we could not get the AAU to agree to be bound by the decisions.

I am not enough of a politician to know why Senator Magnuson's Committee on Commerce was given the chore of handling this particular problem. I think my eyes were opened a little bit at the first Senate hearing in Washington in August, 1965. All the members of Senator Magnuson's committee wanted to talk about was money. They were sure the NCAA was the most wealthy organization in the world. We were receiving at that time about \$13 million a year from television, and this was the tone of the whole questioning by the Senate Committee. It took several meetings before we finally convinced the Senate Commerce Committee that money was not the issue.

We did finally convince them that the football television money went to the member schools and they, themselves, and the conferences were the ones who benefited; the NCAA retained only a small percentage for administrative purposes.

The other argument we heard at that time was that the NCAA was seeking to dominate amateur athletics in the United States, and it took considerable time to convince the Senate this was not the case; that the NCAA, plus many of the other constituent organizations, were actually members of the various federations.

Gentlemen, it has taken two years of hearings and debates to convince the Arbitration Board that the NCAA is but a constituent member of the Federation movement.

**Robert F. Ray** (University of Iowa): I would like, by way of background, to refer to a statement by James B. Pearson, the United States Senator from the State of Kansas, in a presentation before the Commerce Committee of the United States, in which he definitely traces the history of the dispute.

You may wonder why there are just three past presidents of the NCAA here this afternoon to discuss the matter. I presume it is because we could not dig up enough of the other ones to cover the full history of this problem.

The AAU was formed in 1888 and challenged the then existing National Association of Amateur Athletics for the control of amateur athletics in a struggle which could only end in the disbanding of one of the warring factions. The National Association was disbanded.

Early in 1899, intercollegiate sports and the cause of the amateurs was sponsored by the University of California under the rules of the Intercollegiate Organization of Amateur Athletes of America. That organization was the predecessor of the NCAA which came into existence in 1906.

In 1911, the National Federated Committees was organized to study the possibility of establishing separate federations for each sport in the United States and, despite its broad base of support from the variety of amateur sports governing bodies in the NCAA, the committee had only limited success. The AAU opposition stalled its movement during the first several years of its operation. This may have been overcome in time, but with the entrance of the United States into World War I in 1917, the nation's attention was drawn away from less crucial matters and focused on the national war effort.

The dispute flared again in 1920 over the Olympics, again in 1921, in 1926, in 1928 and finally in 1946 an Article of Alliance was signed between the AAU and the NCAA. It was hoped this would help to bring about the finest cooperation between the two groups.

Throughout the remainder of the 1940's and the 1950's, there was apparent harmony between the two organizations. However there were a number of instances during the 1950's which led to criticism and an accumulation of complaints against the administration of both groups. As a result of problems which occurred during a tour of the United States by the Swedish Amateur Basketball Team, the Articles of Alliance were cancelled.

At the request of the NCAA in 1960, joint meetings were held to see if new Articles of Alliance could be brought into existence. Joint meetings were held in December, 1960; on February 8, 1961; and February 11, 1962. These did not prove successful.

In 1962, federations were formed in four major sports, with the help of the NCAA and other organizations. In August of 1962, the NCAA voted to disband the committee it had appointed to negotiate with the AAU.

In November of 1962, the then Attorney-General, Robert Kennedy, brought the disputants together and thought an agreement had been reached between the two, but this, two weeks after the meeting, proved not to be the case.

It was about that time that I became president of this organization, and arrangements were made, at the request of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, for General MacArthur to mediate the dispute. I came into office, as Marcus did, thinking that perhaps this would provide the solution to the problem, and in January of 1963 the MacArthur Agreement was reached.

It was a fairly simple agreement, designed to be enforced until the Olympics of 1964 had been completed, a very simple, brief agreement. (Mr. Ray read the MacArthur Agreement.)

This was the first time the USTFF was recognized in formal proceedings, and it was recognized by General MacArthur.

This Board was to meet at the call of either group and it had a rotating chairmanship.

Finally, General MacArthur made this recommendation: "That it be strongly recommended to the President of the United States that, if desirable following the Olympic Games of 1964, an Athletic Congress be called of as many as possible of the representatives of athletic groups and associations, leading sportsmen and women of the country, such educators and writers as are engaged in the field of sports, to devise a permanent plan under which all organizations dedicated to amateur athletics and all men and women pool their

resources through united effort to be able to meet the challenge of any nation in the field of athletics and sports."

The General elaborated on that last paragraph. He said the agreement was limited as to time and would expire in 1964.

When the 1964 Olympics were over, it was fairly well agreed that there ought to be some kind of additional step to provide a national organization to cover the track and field.

In 1965, when it was not possible to further implement the MacArthur Agreement through the formation of new articles of alliance or nonmembership agreements, and the hearings were called by the Commerce Committee, President Barnes asked me to go before that group. We proposed that there be organized a full representative body to be in control of track and field in this country. We did this because we felt that in the U. S. Track and Field Federation there existed the seed for the solution to this problem. The new organization was not to be controlled by any one organization in the United States, but would be a truly representative one with the best interests of sports represented and in which our country could be best represented by virtue of that control.

This is what we entered into the record: "What is needed is a truly representative body to be in control of track and field in this country. It must be done once and for all with assurance and without contest. Let there come out of these hearings a constructive approach that will result in the new organization of a vehicle in which reason may prevail and an atmosphere of mutual respect. The AAU should be a member. The NCAA should be a member. Every other bona fide organization in track and field should be a member. No single group should control that organization.

"Congress has the right to charter organizations in amateur athletics and has exercised that right in a very high level, the highest in this country, in granting a charter to the U. S. Olympic Committee." (Mr. Ray then read the suggested steps from the record of his testimony.)

Marcus has already alluded to the fact that Senator Pearson has introduced into Congress Resolution No. 59 which is now before the Judiciary Committee and calls for the establishment of an organization precisely along these lines.

I would like also to call your attention to the fact that at the hearings recently conducted before the Commerce Committee, Father Crowley, speaking in behalf of the U. S. Track and Field Federation, made this comment: "I have written to you, Senator Pearson, after our Governing Council meeting of the USTFF, that we are in agreement in principle with what you propose. I will say right now if a true third body could be formed, the USTFF would yield. I would provide for the dissolution of this organization if the AAU would cooperate, and if we would have an all-embracing, single-purpose body. That was the position of the AAU, as I understand it, when they came before you two years ago. They also agreed to keeping the embracing organization of track and field, which is usually called the Federation, rather than having an umbrella organization like the AAU, which controls 12 sports. This third body is the best kind of organization. So I am here to reaffirm our willingness to yield our position if a representative third body can be formed."

What I hope to do this afternoon in raising a bit of the history of this dispute is to remind you of the consistent position of the NCAA in this matter, and I hope once and for all to lay at rest the idea that the dispute is over a simple question of power structure. We have, to my certain knowledge, never sought control of the track and field in the United States. We have hoped consistently that there would be formed an organization of organizations in which rightfully we should play a responsible part, and it is my hope that whatever may happen in the hearings as of now, this solution may be forthcoming. I hope it does not require an act of Congress to get it. I would rather hope that reasonable persons might sit down and recognize that our only hope for salvation in the future, in terms of competent organization, must be structured along these lines.

#### Evaluation of the 1.600 Legislation

**James H. Weaver** (Atlantic Coast Conference): I would like to introduce the members of the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements at this time:

Laurence C. Woodruff, the University of Kansas, long-time dean of students at that institution who just recently has returned to his first academic love, the teaching of biology;

Carl E. Erickson, athletic director at Kent State University;

John A. Fuzak, vice-president and former dean of students at Michigan State University;

Clarence Von Eschen, chairman of the Department of Education at Beloit College;

Ken Vickery of Clemson University, who is representing the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

This is a congenial and dedicated group. We have had a great deal of assistance from the NCAA office and especially Miss Fannie Vaughan. Without this help we might not have been congenial. We believe the legislation in question is a most beneficial one and its long-range benefits for the administration of intercollegiate athletics are just beginning to be realized. It is my intention today to speak primarily to the administration of the rule and provide you with information that we have developed which hopefully will prove helpful to you in weighing the progress that has been made and the advantages which are bound to accrue to the young men who play our sports and to intercollegiate athletics as an educational function.

First, let me give you an accounting of how the NCAA active membership lines up in relationship to NCAA Bylaw 4-6-(b), the legislative term for the 1.600 rule. Of the current active NCAA membership of 603 institutions, 521 or 86.4 per cent have confirmed their policies, procedures and practices to satisfy the requirements of Bylaw 4-6-(b) through these procedures:

102 are using institutional tables

92 are using conference tables

327 are using the national tables

Of the 82 institutions which are ineligible for NCAA events because their procedures and practices do not satisfy the 1.600 re-

quirements, 24 have indicated that paragraph (2) is their stumbling block. Twenty are recently elected members which have not had an opportunity to complete the necessary forms and return them to the executive office.

Next, I would like to make reference to the questionnaire that our committee circularized to the Association's membership. As you know, Bylaw 4-6-(b) was enacted January 13, 1965, to become effective January 1, 1966. It first applied to student-athletes initially entering member institutions subsequent to that date. We undertook a questionnaire designed to secure information from the membership as to the workings of the rule following the 1966-67 academic year. We were disappointed in that only 148 returned their questionnaires when we anticipated a response of at least twice that much. One can debate that this small response was due to disinterest, dissatisfaction with the rule, personality conflicts with the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements or the questionnaire asked for too much information. I suspect the latter was the case since one faculty representative of a rather prominent liberal arts college wrote that he felt that he should get paid for research work in developing the requested data.

The results represented approximately a 25 per cent sampling of our active membership, and it did disclose some interesting statistics to which I am going to refer by percentages.

(a) 3.2 per cent of the freshmen numeral winners and varsity lettermen who were enrolled as of January 1, 1966, would not have predicted 1.600 on the tables now being used as a result of Bylaw 4-6-(b).

(b) Of the student-athletes recruited since January 1, 1966, 11.7 per cent failed to predict 1.600 or better on the table utilized by the recruiting institution.

(c) Considering the student-athletes of the freshman class entering in the fall of 1966 who predicted 1.600 or better on the basis of the tables utilized by the institutions involved, 97.6 per cent completed the academic year. The 2.4 per cent who did not complete the academic year failed to do so for several reasons including those unrelated to academics. Of those which completed the academic year, 89.5 per cent did so with an average of 1.600 or better.

(d) 13 per cent of the responding institutions believe there will be less academic loss at their institutions as a result of the 1.600 legislation.

As the committee most intimately familiar with the workings of the legislation, we want to concur most heartily with the report made by the NCAA officers in behalf of the Association's Council, December 1, 1967. At that time, they told the chief executive officers, faculty representatives and athletic directors of our member institutions that they believed Bylaw 4-6-(b) represents one of the most constructive pieces of legislation in the history of the Association. As they pointed out, there are four specific reasons for this belief:

(1) Through the processes of paragraph (1), member institutions are not required to meet one national standard, but they are asked to identify their academic standards to their sister institutions through institutional or conference tables, or the NCAA national tables. Those members of this Association who have alleged and

deplored "double standards" at other institutions should support most heartily this legislation because it represents the solution and cure for that alleged practice.

(2) Many conferences have developed prediction tables for the first time, thus placing the recruiting process among their member institutions on a more equal and acceptable basis. This can do much more for intra-conference harmony than all the receptions and goodwill dinners combined.

(3) Many institutions which did not have prediction tables have undertaken studies and adopted tables as a result of the rule.

(4) The continuing effect of the legislation is just beginning to be seen. For the first time, institutions have a standard of comparison of the academic level of performance of their respective student bodies and the internal pressures from the faculty of these respective institutions to raise standards is going to have a definite accelerating effect upon those who some NCAA members now feel are operating with institutional and/or conference tables not as high as they should be.

The Committee has been reasonable and, to a degree, lenient in the administration of this legislation. Particularly this has been true as institutions and conferences have developed tables for the first time. In some of the instances, we do not believe that the sampling on which the table has been based has been sufficiently broad and it is our intention in the next year to ask for a restudy to make certain that the table being utilized is representative of the student body of that institution. We envision that the term "Association-approved" tables as set forth in some of the amendments before you is intended to make certain that an institution's table of prediction is a valid one and representative of the male student population of that institution. There is no intention in these amendments, as we understand them, and surely there is no intention within this Committee, to do more than make certain that the table being used is representative. It would violate the very fundamental principle of the legislation to force an institution to use a table which is not representative of its student body.

In the initial months of the administration of this rule, we have permitted tables to be based upon any number of tests including the College Entrance Examination Board tests, American College Testing Program Service, SCAT, and some area tests, such as the New York Regents Tests.

It is our conclusion that in the future, prediction tables must be based upon a national test which has adequate security. It would be our intention under the language of "Association-approved" to require that institutional and conference tables be based upon nationally administered and secured tests. At the present time, only the college boards and the ACT programs meet that criteria. We naturally would provide for and allow a reasonable time for whatever transitions might be required.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes the report, but I would like to make at this time a few personal observations, after which I would like to ask Larry Woodruff to report on a survey that he has been making.

You are not going to believe this, but my daddy was a college president as well as a Methodist minister. I was born on a college

campus, where I apparently accumulated enough semester hours to be discharged. I was employed in athletics, and I have never had any other employment, any employment other than some form of athletics.

First, I was a coach. I wasn't like these coaches that had contracts. It didn't make any difference to me, because I didn't figure I was going to get beat anyway, but I was.

When you get too sorry to coach they make you an athletic director, and I went through that stage. Then a friend came to see me and asked me if I would like to be the commissioner. I said, "What do you want me for?"

He said, "Well, as much cheating as you have done, you ought to know how to catch anybody else." (Laughter)

I am an old man now, walking in the sunset of an athletic career that has been long and arduous and at times most hectic. I suppose it has been 35 years or more since I attended my first NCAA Convention. I have seen the Convention grow from knee pants to maturity. I have seen the Convention with patience intently pass legislation which has led to the NCAA's position in intercollegiate athletics today.

In regard to the 1.600 legislation, I would hope that you give it a fair chance and knock the bugs out of it. There are bugs in it. An automobile is no good on the planning table; you have to run it. I believe if we are patient with it, if we work with it and eliminate the bugs, in the not too distant future you will agree that it is one of the best pieces of legislation that we have had.

**Laurence C. Woodruff** (University of Kansas): Most of you are aware of the fact that the opposition to the 1.600 legislation began long before the legislation actually became effective, certainly long before we had any chance to evaluate the legislation.

When opposition arose, those of us concerned with it demurred, asking for a fair trial, feeling perhaps a two-year trial might give us some measure as to whether the legislation would be effective or not. We really only had one year's trial, certainly not more than that.

The opposition was usually couched in one of three points: that it violated institutional sovereignty, that it took away institutional responsibility, or that it infringed upon institutional freedom.

I think the facts are that the debate over this legislation has, as many of us recognize, created some rather curious bedfellows; that it has brought to light some hypocrisy on the part of some of us in the claims that we make for the prestige of our individual institution when we are not willing to submit to what some of us consider a bare minimum of academic achievement in permitting our students to represent our institutions on the athletic field. It has also brought to light some hypocrisy of amateurism of which this Association has been accused by some of our protagonists and antagonists.

There has not been time really to make an evaluation of this program. Our Committee attempted to do that in the questionnaire which Jim Weaver has summarized for you, and yet that questionnaire reached most of us long before we were able to give adequate answers. There has not been time for the Committee to make a national survey, to make any judgment on this basis.

We in the Big Eight Conference have made a fragmentary survey

of the 1966-67 crop of athletes who were certified by their respective institutions as qualifying under the 1.600 legislation.

There were 980 such athletes certified by our eight institutions and some rather interesting facts came out about these. Eight-six per cent of them ranked in the upper half of their high school class. Less than one per cent of them ranked in the bottom quarter of their high school class. I assume that the other 14 per cent had some special attribute, such as being able to run 100 in 9.6 in full regalia or an ontological advantage of an uncle or a father who was a staunch financial supporter of the institution or some other reason.

Among these 980 athletes, the average score on the ACT examination was 22.1; on the SCAT battery, 997.

Their average accomplishment during the two semesters of 1966-67, was 2.09; ten per cent exactly achieved better than the 3.0 level; 65 per cent better than the 2.0 level; 80 per cent exactly achieved 1.600 or better, leaving 20 per cent of the 980 who did not make it.

You remember when this legislation was first described to us we were told that it was geared to an 80 per cent accuracy. I don't know how more accurate you can get for 980 athletes when 80 per cent of them make it and 20 per cent do not.

I am not sure of the feeling of some of the rest of you in this regard, but I do know on my own campus that the attitude of my academic colleagues toward this legislation is a feeling of the ridiculous, that here you are purporting to have young men representing your institution who are slightly more than a D average in their performance, which on our campus is below our standard for continuance.

In the National Collegiate Athletic Association we must not forget that the emphasis is collegiate. We are collegiate institutions. Most of us who are concerned with this thing are members of a collegiate community and have a responsibility to our academic colleagues to stem what some of us feel is a continual erosion on the integrity of our academic standards. It seems to me the 1.600 legislation is minimal in our efforts to put some sort of an academic rank on the performance of our so-called student-athletes, and I shudder when I think what the *New York Times* headline will read should this legislation be abandoned: the National Collegiate Athletic Association has abandoned academic standards for its athletes.

**Clarence Von Eschen** (Beloit College): I represent a private institution in a conference of private institutions that might have been opposed to the legislation on the ground of institutional sovereignty. However, we have not been opposed to it, on the assumption that it makes academic sense to place an academic floor, small as it may be, under the student-athlete, and in so doing we are not only supporting a small measure of academic excellence, but we are also presenting an image of which this institution can be proud.

I should also like to call your attention to Mr. Woodruff's comments about the institutions rejecting the legislation in fear of the image of retaining individual responsibility. It seems to me the private institution, even though it may not be affected directly by this legislation, ought to support what the legislation is attempting to do and build an image, if we mean it, that does imply that we want good academic record as well as good athletics.

**Albert W. Twitchell** (Rutgers University): In this legislation there is no provision for a program for the culturally deprived. My president gave me a letter before I came here and asked if I would present our problem to you, so I am speaking just for Rutgers University.

It is his opinion that the real impact of the change in time does not solve the problem completely. He believes there are social and political implications, particularly in state institutions, that make requirements upon us very rigid. He is concerned about the standards that have come from this legislation. We would never think, of course, of any admission policy that is not at least as strong as this, and I am sure we could not be indicted for hypocrisy along the way. However, there is no flexibility that will allow us to handle this program which we feel obliged to do.

For example, we had this fall a youngster from a culturally deprived area who had a 1.542. Our wise academic and administrative admissions group, plus our 17-man financial aid committee, spent a great deal of time and decided this boy should get the opportunity to come to Rutgers University and that if he came he should not be a second-class citizen, he should have every right for extra-curricular activity. This youngster wanted to play freshman football and we allowed him to do so. As a result, our cross country team was not allowed to compete in the NCAA Championships.

Despite our full support of the NCAA and recognition of the objective of this rule, we just cannot live by it.

Our president is hoping there will be consideration for an amendment to the NCAA Council's proposal, provided that the earlier vote is against repeal, such as this: "That exceptions to paragraph (1), may be permitted, provided that: (a) the exceptions are made in accordance with established over-all university policy; (b) notification of the acceptance is made, both to the NCAA and the colleges which might be involved in competition; and (c) the normal admissions policy for the college is on record with the NCAA."

**Mr. Fuzak:** We at Michigan State University have had several programs designed specifically for the culturally deprived. We have not had athletes involved up to this point. These programs are designed specifically to work with people who would not ordinarily meet admission requirements and admission standards. They have been confined to our own state, within our own state, and of course primarily from the Grand Rapids and Detroit areas.

I don't believe you can call an individual a second-class citizen because he does not participate or is not expected to participate in intercollegiate athletics during that first year. There are a good many other extra-curricular programs, including the intramural program of which many of us are so proud, in which it might be far more appropriate for this individual to participate.

Our own experience over some five and one-half years has been that it does take a great deal of extra effort, counseling and work with these individuals to try to insure their success in college.

Now, extra effort has a time relationship. We have provided rather extensive counseling and worked with people on how to study and given them remedial work in reading skills and it does take a great deal of time.

It is not at all inappropriate to say that this individual, until he

establishes himself and the likelihood of his success in college, ought not to participate in intercollegiate athletics, that the competitive aspects and the pressure of intercollegiate athletics are perhaps quite time-consuming. So I don't think you are treating an individual as a second-class citizen when you take him, recognizing that he does not meet the ordinary requirements, but there are reasons why he does not meet those requirements so you are going to work to get him up to that point.

We all have that responsibility and obligation these days, as has been pointed out, but I don't know that intercollegiate athletics should be required or expected to provide some exception in this category.

**Anthony R. Kuolt** (Montclair State College): We in the state of New Jersey are faced this past year with severe problems with the culturally disadvantaged or economically deprived. Our president feels we have an obligation to these people. It isn't only in the Negro ghetto; there are other areas in the country where white people are involved. Presently there is legislation in Congress for the bilingual people; the people in Texas and California I am sure are familiar with this legislation and familiar with the problem.

For this reason, we feel, as Rutgers does, that there should be some place we can handle these people.

If we consider athletics, as we do in our own institution, as building educational leadership, one place we can develop this leadership is through the athletic department and through the coach. More and better guidance is probably done by the coaches in this country than by some of our academic people. The coach can do more for these people than some of our professional counselors.

Montclair State is involved with a program called Talent Research for Youth. We are getting a grant of \$40,000. We are looking for these people and getting them into a situation like this. We feel athletics is a part of the whole picture. We are not a high-pressure institution, but we believe we have to do something for these people.

**John W. Winkin** (Colby College): Perhaps I misunderstood a statement made earlier which, as I understood it, was that those who oppose this legislation are resorting to hypocrisy.

I would like to say that Colby College certainly supports the spirit of the legislation. We have an honest problem with paragraph (2), and I have come with the hope that I can go home with a solution to that problem. Certainly as far as anything we do at our college, we do not feel that in any way we are being hypocritical.

**Mr. Erickson:** I would like to ask the gentleman from Colby if the Council's recommendation answers his problem. We have tried to meet the needs of those schools that have objections to the second part of the legislation. I believe that Amendment I does. Does that meet with your approval now?

**Mr. Winkin:** I would rather not comment on that at this time.

**Chairman McCoy:** Mr. Weaver has suggested the possibility that as time goes on and the legislation stays on the books, there are ways and means of ironing out the difficulties that we find in it.

(The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.)

## COLLEGE DIVISION ROUND TABLE

Tuesday Morning, January 9, 1968

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m.; Wilford H. Ketz, Union College, presiding.

**Chairman Ketz:** This morning I would like to start our program by hearing from our retiring Vice-President, who has been our faithful servant for four years on the Executive Committee and Council. Dean Trevor of Knox College.

**Mr. Trevor:** Having been your vice-president for the past four years has been the finest thing that has ever been experienced by me in 42 years of association with collegiate athletics. As you know, the vice-president-at-large attends all meetings of the Council and the Executive Committee. I don't see how it could be possible year after year to elect and appoint a more capable and dedicated group of men. The vice-president-at-large also attends meetings of the College Committee, and I can say that I have been impressed just as much with the competence of these men as with the members of the Council and the Executive Committee.

On numerous occasions, after lengthy debate, I have seen men cast votes for legislation which they deemed best for the College Division, even though it might have an adverse effect on their own programs.

Since its formation, the College Committee has had many problems. It still has problems, some of which will be discussed at this round table and at future round tables, but I predict that these problems will be solved and the College Division will in the future improve its stature each year just as it has in the past years.

**Chairman Ketz:** The College Division of the NCAA is the growing division. The institutions which have been submitted for membership this year are in the College Division. At the present time we have roughly 450 out of approximately 600 members of the NCAA in the College Division.

The College Division is bound to be an increasing part of the NCAA athletic program. This year we are instituting our eighth and ninth national championships. Eleven years ago, in 1957, basketball was the first College Division championship established followed in 1958 by cross country.

The newest championship in our program will be baseball.

**James H. Witham** (University of Northern Iowa): This will be a short announcement, but I want to bring you up to date, so you can spread the word throughout your areas. The College Baseball Championship will be played at Springfield, Missouri with Southwest Missouri State and its athletic director, Aldo Sebben, in charge of the arrangements at the site.

We have a guarantee of \$8,000. The teams will be chosen through four regionals; the Atlantic Coast, the Mideast, the Midwest and the Pacific Coast. Four teams will compete in each region.

Keep your selection committee up to date as far as the teams in your particular region, so that we can select the four best teams for the regionals.

**Chairman Ketz:** The College Committee has spent considerable time talking about the recommendation of the cross country coaches that three of the teams in the College Division Championships be permitted to compete in the National Collegiate Championships.

The Committee reaffirmed the position it took a year ago; that only individuals should be allowed to continue to the National Collegiate Championships.

The primary purpose of this round table is to give you an opportunity to discuss questions which are before the College Committee. The Committee is tremendously interested in hearing your viewpoints, because it will then be better able to reflect the views of the College Division membership in its decisions.

Now I will introduce to you the members of our panel. We will not have presentations of a formal nature, but will have a general discussion. Our panel in alphabetical order:

Harvey Chrouser of Wheaton College; John Dillon, Mount St. Mary's College; Howard Gentry, Tennessee A & I State University; Jim Higgins, Lamar State College of Technology; Joe Pease, Kansas State Teachers College at Emporia.

### Problems of Dual Membership

In the past we have had a considerable number of members who have had dual membership in both NAIA and NCAA. This number seems to be on the decrease, if for no other reason than periodically one withdraws from one of the organizations and remains in the second.

When should we look forward to establishing a rule that you should belong to one or the other? Or isn't that serious? Is it a problem? Should it be left as it is?

**Bill LaGuardia** (Montclair State College): We originally were members of the NAIA, because the NCAA had no college activities, and we thought it was to our advantage. However, since the NCAA has now come up with College Division activities we are resigning as of this year from the NAIA, as are other schools in our area who have been in the same position.

Legislation might help the school to this extent. Our basketball team may go to the NAIA tournament if we so desire, our gymnastics or baseball teams might wish to compete in the NCAA College Division. We have no stimulation here, if we have a problem, but the NAIA is now putting on probation schools that compete in NCAA championships.

For that reason, we could help ourselves if we adopted a regulation to encourage schools to give up dual membership.

**B. T. Harvey** (Miles College): I am formerly from Alabama State College. I was a coach and athletic director for many years at Morehouse, and went on to become the commissioner of the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Morehouse held membership in the NCAA when the only thing we did was come to the Convention.

Max Green started the National Athletic Steering Committee with a group of volunteers using money out of our own pockets,

because previous effort had been made to get representation in a national playoff in the NCAA. We finally got representation in the NAIA.

I have always been on the side of any national organization which gave us representation and opposed to any national organization which prohibited Negro representation.

The members of the SIAC are required by the Constitution to belong to both the NCAA and the NAIA. We live up to all of the rules and regulations of the NCAA with reference to practice and so forth, but with us it is a question of representation.

Most of the NCAA competition, except in basketball, is so far away that it presents a great financial burden for us to get there. We like the idea of freedom of choice, because sometimes it is easier for our representative to go to the NAIA than to the corresponding NCAA event.

We have seen the College Division of the NCAA develop, and personally I feel that the College Division was helped in this development by our going into the NAIA. I would surely like to see freedom of choice. I don't think they ought to ask the membership to make a choice, because a lot of our schools are not as strong financially as other schools.

I have told the NAIA representatives that I don't think they ought to put on any restrictions either. They think they have precedence since, in their opinion, some of the NCAA championships were set up in direct opposition to NAIA dates, so that automatically you do break NAIA rules if you don't go to the NAIA.

**John W. Winkin** (Colby College): Having been involved in the experience of running tournaments, I believe that we do have a problem in this regard to institutions that have dual membership. It seems to me that it ought to be very clear, as far as the NCAA is concerned, that an institution cannot compete in both the NAIA and NCAA tournaments. Even though they have dual membership, they should be expected to choose one or the other.

**Marshall S. Turner, Jr.** (Johns Hopkins University): I would like to add a historical footnote. In the very beginning of the College Committee and College Division activities in the fifties, dual membership was no problem because the interest at that time was essentially in matters of information and knowledge to help the College Division athletic directors to do a better job. There was no championship activity in the early days. It was initiated in 1957 in basketball.

It wasn't until the championship activities began that the question of dual membership came up.

I note this question is becoming a little more critical. I understand it is not only in the case of championships, but possibly in the assignment to the various committees of the organizations involved.

Certainly the freedom of choice principle is something we have always advocated around the NCAA, but I do believe when we are talking about team selection, that it might be reasonable to expect the institutions who hold dual membership to be asked to say at the start of a particular season with which conference or which Association they would prefer to be identified.

Where individuals have choice as to an open cross country or

track meet, it is not so important, but when you are selecting baseball teams, basketball teams or football teams, it seems reasonable that at the beginning of the season the institutions holding dual membership make the decision so either of the associations can plan on that basis.

**Edward L. Jackson** (Tuskegee Institute): As has been pointed out, many institutions do hold dual membership. I realize there may be some administrative difficulties at times in conducting some events, however, fundamentally I see nothing wrong with an institution belonging to both the NAIA and the NCAA.

I think competition is the way of life in America and it has certain good aspects, but I think too frequently we tend to think too much in competitive terms, one versus the other. I have heard such terms used in this connection as that one cannot serve two masters. I don't think that is true. One can serve two masters and belong to two organizations.

An individual can belong to the AAHPER and the National College of Physical Education, but they are not exclusive. I don't see why this should be thought of as in those terms. There are many hundreds of institutions. I remember a survey I made at one time as to whether there were enough institutions, to justify two organizations, and we found there were an ample number.

I believe we should think less of competitive terms and more of supplemental terms and allow this freedom of choice. We do realize that sometimes conflicts will occur and choices will have to be made. I think those choices should be made without any penalty, whether it is the membership of committees or competing in championship events.

In the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, with which I am identified, we have had meetings with representatives at the top level of both the NCAA and the NAIA, and both of the administrative leaders indicate in these conferences that it is perfectly all right for the institutions to belong to both organizations and that there were no restrictions, but sometimes we hear rumblings of dissent when it seems that a person is operating in both areas.

I personally am in favor of dual membership, and I think it should be allowed without penalty.

**Richard P. Koenig** (Valparaiso University): Have those "rumblings" ever been connected with the NCAA, and if so, in what way?

**Mr. Jackson:** Not so much from the NCAA as from the NAIA.

**Mr. Koenig:** Thank you. I am chairman of the College Basketball Committee. I would have to say, in all honesty, yes, we have had some problems. But I would also have to say our problems have been going down in proportion to the increase in stature which the NCAA's College Division has attained.

I support what Marshall Turner, indicated:

(1) The NCAA is a voluntary organization. We set certain standards, and if an individual school meets these standards, we grant them membership.

(2) I support Ed Jackson's position, that there should be freedom of choice.

(3) I support the position that this freedom of choice should

come at a time when every tournament can plan efficiently.

I can cite two illustrations. Last year, we extended an invitation to compete in the College Division Tournament. The individual school did not feel—bear in mind this is toward the end of the basketball season—that they were in a position to give us an answer, whereupon we withdrew the invitation.

Every school certainly knows or should know what its objectives are, and personally I don't see any reason why, at the start of a given season, the individual school should not indicate whether it wants to be considered for our tournament.

**Delegate:** We are affiliated with the Southwestern Athletic Conference and we belong to both organizations, primarily for three reasons. We believe in the conference affiliation and in our location we fall into two districts. Three schools in Texas and one in Arkansas are in District 6. Three schools in Louisiana and two in Mississippi are in District 3. Yet we are relatively close to each other.

Secondly, we play freshmen.

Finally, we run into budget problems. For instance, down at Southern University they have a good track team and a fellow like Willie Davenport can go to one national meet and move into the Olympic trials. As this is an Olympic year, I am sure he will go to the NAIA, where if he is in the top field he will go to the Olympic trials, rather than go to the NCAA, where he would have to go to another meet to qualify and it would become a budgetary problem.

**Joseph Pease** (Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia): We have a little different problem than most. The institution I represent has been a member of both organizations since their inception. We started with the NAIB, which partially originated on our campus.

We are in a state where we are the only one that belongs to the NCAA, outside of the Universities. We are pretty much hemmed in as far as our competition is concerned, and I think we might have a problem if the NCAA suddenly abolished the idea of dual membership. For that reason, I hope they do not.

I do like the idea of freedom of choice. I would hope in the future there might be more cooperation between the two organizations, but I cannot honestly say this will happen.

I do support the idea that the institutions ought to prepare themselves early enough so both organizations can determine what teams they will have in the tournament. Currently we do not have any choice as far as NCAA events. Ours is automatic. In the future I hope something can be worked out so that in the fall we can say, "I am going this way," or that way. I cannot see where that would create any problems.

**Ross Smith** (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I don't believe any census is taken on the action here, but would it be helpful to the Committee if the consensus was expressed? I propose this group express its opinion; that it opposes any future legislation concerning dual membership and give the authority to each Tournament Committee to request deadline designations consistent with the interests of the sports.

**Chairman Ketiz:** I prefer not to have a proposal in a round table,

but I do think we ought to get a consensus which I would like to do so long as the discussion is over.

How many feel there should be freedom of choice at this time? (The majority raised their hands.)

### Freshman Rule

**Chairman Ketiz:** Years ago, when the freshman rule was established at 750 there were two different ideas as to why it was established at that point. One was that if you have 750 people you should be able to conduct a program. Another was that this was one way of making sure of quality.

Since then the number has been raised. Some people feel we are getting into the numbers game. And suddenly the question comes up: Should we abolish all rules regarding the number of freshmen and leave it to the institutions to get their competition with those schools they believe are on an equal basis with themselves? It is an interesting idea.

**Mr. Pease:** I cannot find any philosophical basis for making the rule in the first place. It doesn't make any sense at all. For five years I have been getting up in meetings and saying we ought to abolish it.

If a student's interest in athletics interferes with the student's study and academic progress in the institution, it is still going to interfere with the institution of 500 or 5000. I don't see how it makes any difference.

We point out that the demands on the student-athlete in the freshman year are severe and the boy ought to become acclimated and so on, so we set up certain regulations, that he must play only with freshmen a limited number of games, then we make him practice four and a half or five hours a day.

If the University Division wants to retain it for financial reasons or what have you, that is fine. But for the College Division, it just doesn't make any sense.

**Mr. Turner:** Mr. Pease, do I deduce from your statement that you think the freshman rule for football and basketball should not be continued and that the freshmen should be allowed to compete in any sport at any time?

**Mr. Pease:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Turner:** My concern about the freshman rule is not so much in terms of numbers or development of competition, but it serves more than anything else as the source from which the present amendment has come. The major purpose of this is to reduce the cost of your athletic program. By eliminating some of your employees and retention of freshman squads and football and basketball you have not carried the thing through to a logical conclusion.

We have advocated in the NCAA the promotion of sports programs and the number of kids participating in sports. Everybody who has had a freshman program realizes you end up with more total participants in the sports program than if you do not have a freshman squad.

If we adopt the proposed amendment and take away the opportunity to participate in some of the other sports so that the money will go to increase the activities in football and basketball, which are already more expensive, we are doing exactly the opposite of

what we have been advocating for so long. We already seem to have a bad image in the public, and it seems to me this is a real step backward.

**I. V. Davis** (St. Francis College, Loretto): We play freshmen in all sports except basketball. With the addition of the 1,600 rule, allowing only people who can do college work to compete, freshman competition is no longer a factor.

In other sports such as track, baseball, and tennis, we would have trouble fielding a team if freshmen were not eligible. Could we eliminate the freshman rule and let the individual schools decide whether or not they want to play freshmen.

**George Hansell** (PMC Colleges): I agree with Marshall Turner's first remark, but have some objection to his second remark, that this gets more freshmen into activities. We find it very difficult to field the freshman team. We will have three boys come out for tennis and five for swimming. This year in soccer we started with 18, and we finished with nine. Last year in freshman baseball the same thing happened. We could have said, "I just don't have a team. Can I drop the rest of the schedule?"

If we would put forth this proposal for the reason that it will allow freshmen actually to compete on varsity or subvarsity, it will give them a chance to compete in more sports, rather than having a program where you have one tennis player or one golf player. It is unfair to these boys to eliminate them from varsity competition for one year. If they don't play in the freshman year they are not going to play in a subsequent year. If the boy does not come out in his freshman year because he has no chance to make the team, he won't come out in subsequent years.

**H. G. McCurdy** (Wesleyan University): I disagree on the philosophy of this whole thing. It seems to me for many, many years we have advocated intercollegiate athletics as a real integral part of our educational program, and if competition is good for boys—and I believe sincerely it is—then all the boys who can possibly be gotten into the competition should be competing. At Wesleyan, which is a college of 1,300 students, we have a large number of freshmen who actually have competition who would never have it if we did not have the freshman rule.

I believe very strongly in the freshman rule, even for a college as small as we are.

**William M. Bell** (North Carolina A & T State University): In reference to the cutoff number for freshman competition, we all realize we do not select our athletes today from the general student body. We ought really to forget about a minimum number altogether and let freshmen participate in any institution, regardless of the number of men we have enrolled, or not let them participate.

**Earl C. Lory** (University of Montana): We have a different reason in the West, a financial reason. When you have to travel 500 miles for an athletic contest, freshmen are out automatically. Every freshman is out, because financially you just cannot have a freshman team travel that distance. You cannot in sports other than basketball and football field a freshman team.

The East, where you travel 50 or 100 miles is entirely different from the West, where you travel 500 or 1,000 miles. We would like to see the freshmen have that opportunity.

**Chairman Ketz:** In a positive way, I ask you to register your sentiment as to whether there should be a continuing study of this problem with a view to the possible elimination in a year or so. (The chairman indicated the majority favored elimination of the 1250 limit in the freshman rule.)

**Mr. Smith:** We ought to work toward permissiveness. This would permit the school to do about as they need to, to meet its own situation. We believe without the freshman squads we will never have a varsity. With the number of high school students who come to us, as I say, who want to learn what we are prepared to teach them, we will do what we are going to do anyway. It won't hurt us, no matter how you change the rule.

**Mr. Pease:** I cannot see where the freshman rule prohibits competition. More power to those institutions which want to run a junior varsity program. If they have the finances, I think they ought to do it. I cannot see that the elimination of the freshman rule actually is a deterrent to the scope of your program at all. I think it is strictly up to you.

**Ernest C. Casale** (Temple University): I would like to bring up the matter of facilities. We all have the same situation where the buildings are going up every day and the number of fields available to us are fewer and fewer. Many of us are running into problems, and possibly some of our problems would be solved by elimination of the rule.

### Third Competitive Division

**Chairman Ketz:** Let us consider the possibility of the creation of a third competitive division. At the present time we have two divisions; the University Division and the College Division. The thought has been expressed that in the future we would have a number of institutions which might be classed as universities but may not be strong enough for that competition, but much too strong for the College Division.

**James Higgins** (Lamar State College of Technology): I believe we would be definitely in favor of a third division since we would fall into that middle group. We compete in the University Division in track many times and play from one to three teams in football in the University Division. I see nothing in this proposal that would preclude scheduling people in the University Division. It looks to me like it would create an opportunity for more championship competition for a greater number of teams and also might answer the question of dual membership.

**John Dillon** (Mount St. Mary's College): Almost everybody wants a third competitive division, but nobody knows where it should be divided. If you put it in you might very well have to have a realignment of a number of conference schedules. Some of the people I have talked to think numbers should not be a consideration at all, but the kind of program. Of the people to whom I have talked, nine out of ten favor an intermediate division of some sort.

**Mr. Chrouser:** When the College Division was started there were various reasons, but the main one was to give more competition so the colleges that were smaller would not have to compete against the big schools. Little did we realize ten or twelve years ago, that at this time we would be confronted with the same situation that existed then.

We are quite close to this in the National College Division Cross Country Championships. In the first meet in 1958 there were 22 schools, twelve of which had an enrollment of 500 to 2,000, and the ten remaining were under 3,000, but a few were over 3,000.

In 1967, there were 63 entries; 32 schools had under 2,000 students; 11 between 2,000 and 5,000; and 20, between 5,000 and 20,000 or 22,000. The first four finishers had an enrollment of between 6,000 to 18,000.

In the membership of the NCAA, there are 203 schools which have under 1,000 men; 68 have 1,000 to 2,000; 34 between 2,000 and 3,000; 25 between 3,000 and 5,000; and 14 over 5,000.

Somebody mentioned that numbers did not affect your athletic team, that you didn't get your athletes from all the students. If you have a broad program that is not true. Numbers do affect athletic capability.

Fifteen to twenty per cent of the College Division schools have grown so rapidly that we have the same inequity that existed in 1955 or 1956 when the college program was conceived.

**William Wright** (Norfolk State College): If an intermediate unit, between the College Division and the University Division, were established it might curtail what the College Division has been looking forward to.

Right now we are still limited from the standpoint of the type of national competition we can gain for our athletes, as opposed to the University Division.

What are we after? Mainly prestige. For what? For College Division sports. And with the establishment of an intermediate unit perhaps those institutions that really fall in the College Division might be hindered.

**Chairman Ketiz:** At the present time, there are 113 University Division institutions, 355 College Division and 114 which have split programs. Most of the strength for a division would come from the 114 in the middle, and to some extent from the 355 below.

**Mr. Winkin:** I was very interested to learn that the word "small" has been removed from all College Division nomenclature.

Let's face the facts. We are now small, medium, and large. In the past couple of years, the College Division football representative to the Tangerine Bowl from our area has been, what we classify from the small college standpoint, a large-enrollment school, one with which we could not compete in any sport. We have a natural division line for tripartite division by just going back to small, medium and large.

**George Shiebler** (Eastern College Athletic Conference): In the ICAAAA about five years ago, interest was expressed in having a College Division cross country championship for both freshmen and varsity runners. The suggestion was approved and we had successful College Division cross country meets. We now have four cross country runs the day of our championships.

Rather than deciding the competition on the basis of enrollment, the executive committee of the ICAAAA asked the coaches to submit their applications to see if they qualified for the College Division. It so happened that some of these teams compete in the College Division cross country championships. If it was fast competition during the indoor season or track competition in the outdoor

season they would be in the University Division, but by submitting their qualifications and past record in the sport of cross country they have been satisfied to be placed in the College Division.

**Ernest C. Casale** (Temple University): The College Football Committee had quite a problem. There are some so-called small colleges which had big enrollments. The best small colleges had records of 10 and 0, and others had records of 8 and 2, but were not selected for regional play.

How do you justify it? How does the small college have a chance to participate? Somehow or other to be fair to the so-called small college, I think you must do something like this and at the same time give the intermediate school a chance. The program has to be divided into the schools with the highly subsidized programs and those with no subsidization.

**Mr. Smith** (MIT): The proposed amendment which would permit a school to elect College Division in three sports says: "A change in competitive designation from University Division to College Division in any of the three sports may be accomplished by petitioning the NCAA College Committee." The next sentence reads: "If the change is approved by the Executive Committee . . ."

Is it the intent of the Committee to exercise the judgment Mr. Shiebler spoke of, that is actually taking a look at whether the school belongs in the College Division by whatever criteria may be established?

Does the intent of this legislation involve then some sort of analysis of the school's status and either approval or disapproval?

**Chairman Ketiz:** It was thought that if the amendment went through there would be consideration of each change by the Executive Committee.

**Cecil Coleman** (Fresno State College): Speaking as a member of an institution representing the conference that sponsored this amendment, it was proposed due to our current needs.

I was interested in the remarks John Winkin made about the smaller institutions that do not have an opportunity to get into one of the regional football championships because they are competing with the larger institutions. It might interest you to know that the College Football Committee will be considering at its next meeting the possibility of having two additional games which will take care of that.

**Mr. Turner:** As an early member of the College Committee, it is very interesting to hear the discussion here about determining classifications because that is the problem we had in the fifties; trying to determine how you can objectively and arbitrarily distinguish between small and large. Now it is small, medium and large.

Another thought which has been expressed is that there are a good many schools who do not anticipate an annual visit to a national championship or even a regional championship, but who do like to feel that every once in a while when they might come up with a good team or a good kid in track or tennis or golf that they have an opportunity to participate. If that opportunity is negated by competition from larger institutions that are always present at these events, this hurts those schools which occasionally come up with a good team or good individual.

There is a possibility that if you establish a small division not many schools among the so-called small colleges would plan for it every year, and there may be difficulty in getting participants.

I am talking against it, but I think essentially I am in favor of some way for each school to have a fighting chance when it comes up with a good team.

**Mr. Pease:** Everybody seems to be in favor of another division. In fact, one school wants four divisions. Some think the divisions should be on the basis of numbers, and some think it should be on the basis of financial aid.

It seems to me if we had three divisions based on numbers and had the same flexibility we have right now between the two, this would solve the problem.

**Mr. Higgins:** We probably shouldn't get into the area of determining the limits of the divisions. We have the present policy of institutional determination, and it seems to me that should suffice. I think the schools would find their level.

**James C. Loveless (DePauw University):** It seems to me we are skirting the whole idea because all of us know that a school that has 2,000 or 3,000 students and a large athletic budget is going to qualify for more playoffs than the school which does not have any athletic association funds upon which to operate. When we talk about size, we are just not facing up to these things.

**Walter Hass (University of Chicago):** A couple of years ago I was on a panel with a gentleman from Lake Forest and a gentleman from Southern Illinois, and we discussed this very problem. We decided it would take another Solomon to divide the group for competition. If you are going to have three divisions let each school decide where it belongs. Size has little to do with it; it is the philosophy of your program.

**Mr. Chrouser:** I would like to speak to the point that we should go slow in third division thinking because of the prestige of the present College Division. While prestige is a factor, what we are interested in is competition in as many sports as possible.

On the subject of dual membership, anybody who works with any College Division events realizes this is a factor. The size of the present College Division schools is a factor in the number of dual members because the schools are going to seek the level of competition which they can manage. That is why there are 162 institutions with dual membership, and the number of dual-membership schools is not decreasing but increasing.

In conducting the Cross Country Championships, we get telephone calls from real fine colleges with pretty good teams asking what large schools are going to be there. They feel it is worth while for them to come if there are some giants present, but when there are a whole host of giants it makes them think differently. If they have dual membership they will seek this competition some other place.

**Chairman Ketz:** Just to be helpful to the College Committee, I am asking for a show of hands of those who feel that a third competitive division would be helpful. (The majority was in favor.)

Now, of those who were in favor, how many are now primarily in the University Division for one reason or another? (No hands were raised.)

Are there any comments in regard to the regional championship program? We have 18 of them scheduled for this year, and we have the four football bowls. Are we doing the right thing in the development of this program? Are there any comments at all on that? We are not sure on this particular topic. No comment?

### National Championships

At the present time we have nine national championships. They are in basketball, cross country, golf, tennis, track, wrestling, swimming, baseball and gymnastics. We do not have championships in lacrosse, hockey, indoor track and soccer. Would anyone like to give a viewpoint on any one of these events.

**William C. Partin (Emory University):** There is sentiment here for soccer. Of course, it was only adopted in 1959 as a University Division sport, and perhaps this is not the time to start a College Division championship.

I would like to ask if there is anyone here, who is interested in starting a College Division Soccer Championship?

**Chairman Ketz:** Soccer has been in the regional program, of course, but is not in the national championship field. How many here would be interested in a national soccer tournament? (Approximately 60 people raised their hands in favor.)

**Huntley Parker (Brockport State College):** I am president of the Intercollegiate Soccer Football Association. The sentiment at our most recent meeting was definitely in favor of a National College Division Championship. It is one of the fastest growing sports in the colleges of the United States and many colleges do not feel they can compete with Michigan State and St. Louis.

The ISFA would be behind any movement toward a national championship in the College Division.

**Chairman Ketz:** Our agenda has been completed. Are there any comments from the floor particularly addressed to the College Committee?

**Lysle Butler (Oberlin College):** Mr. Chairman, about every four or five years we make a small plea at this College Division meeting for more programs considering other things than championships. As you look down through the agenda there today, you find practically everything, with perhaps the exception of the freshman rule, relates specifically to championship competition. I think for this part of the NCAA membership there are a lot of things which might be more competently discussed.

When the discussion centers on NCAA policies in relation to recruiting or what to do with the television program money we seem to get shut off and have no opportunity to express the small college point of view. There are many more important programs than championships which we might discuss; for instance, the problems related to recruiting and athletic scholarships and scholarships based on the need factor, where we could recommend something to the Long Range Planning Committee on the separation of the legislation in the NCAA.

This has been hinted, but I don't think it is ever going to get off the floor unless the small-college group does a little pushing in this area. We have quite a different philosophy. Many of the larger institutions think the sole purpose of athletics is to im-

prove the image of the institution. Many of the rest of us, and I suppose most of us in the small-college group, hope to keep athletics as a part of the educational program.

**Chairman Ketz:** Your idea is an excellent one. Sometimes we get too steamed up with the practical aspects of the program rather than with talking about the general philosophy.

One thing that you mentioned is going to come to the foreground. It is time for the NCAA to say, "This should be considered by and voted upon by the College Division," or "This should be taken care of by the University Division."

(The meeting recessed at 11:10 a.m.)

## HONORS LUNCHEON

Tuesday, January 9, 1968

The Honors Luncheon was held in the Grand Ballroom of the Biltmore Hotel and was called to order by the President of the Association, Marcus L. Plant.

**President Plant:** Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to welcome you to this Honors Luncheon of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The activities that we engage in here are not only a pleasure, but they are also compatible with the goals and aims of our Association. One of the tenets upon which our faith in inter-collegiate athletics is based is that of the worthy competitor, the man who does his best, the man who has given his all, the man who strives for ever higher levels of excellence, and who aspires in activities and talents to the greatest extent of his capacity and potential.

Another of our tenets is that excellence in athletics comports well with academic excellence, and that it is not inconsistent with athletic aims, but that the latter lends substantial support to the former. Our concept of the student-athlete is one whose athletic excellence goes hand-in-hand with academic excellence.

Perhaps the third of the principles to which I refer is we believe the values of intercollegiate athletics are continuing, that they affect the individual in his later life, that they are an asset to him.

With these principles and tenets in mind, we meet these distinguished gentlemen who are with us today. This is our way of saying to those assembled here in this city and in the United States and throughout the world; this is what we are doing, this represents the culmination of our ideals, here is evidence to prove the point.

Our master of ceremonies is the key man on the very capable staff of the American Broadcasting Company, one of the nation's most knowledgeable, astute and most honored news commentators. He has won virtually every award the radio and television community has to give. He is a notable author, was an outstanding track athlete during his undergraduate days at Tulane, was a Rhodes Scholar and has been honored by five honorary degrees. By this time you know I am talking about Howard K. Smith, and it certainly is a pleasure to present him to you.

**Toastmaster Smith:** Mr. Plant, Honored Guests, Members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association: I am honored to be your master of ceremonies, but I confess to a degree of inadequacy among so many men of great achievement in athletics and professional success.

In these what I like to call my middle years my only real sport is jumping, jumping at conclusions. President Plant suggested that in my youth I had moments of glory, which were in the 1930's when I ran in second place to the great Forrest Towns who won

the Olympics in 1936 in the high hurdles. In both of those cases he broke the world's record. In our race I admit there was daylight between first and second. To be quite frank, there was enough daylight to have read with some pleasure the Sports Section of the Sunday New York Times.

But I still once made the mistake of boasting to my young son that I ran second to Towns when he ran the race in 14.1. My son asked what my time was, and I said with modesty, "14.4." Like all his generation, with today's fantastic records, he looked at me totally coldly, and said, "What did you fellows run in, in those days, rubber boots and fur coats?"

At that time I had the privilege of being coached by the great Tad Gorman, of New Orleans, and to become infused with his philosophy of sport. He would place his arm over my shoulder and say, "Son, I want you to remember that it's not whether you win or lose, but how you play the game, but if you lose keep running—you damned well better not show up at practice tomorrow!"

He did as much as any man to bend, if not break, the color line in sports in the South. He had under his wing at one time one of America's great middle distance runners. He got on his mark, got in the stretch and his eyes strayed and he saw on the line next to him a Negro. In the end this man did not run. He simply stood in his place and then walked off the track.

There waiting for him on the sidelines was Tad Gorman. He put his arm around the boy's shoulder and said, "Let's go in the dressing room and have a talk."

The boy came out and ran the 880. There were three Negro competitors, and he won. I approached the runner and said, "What did Tad say to you in the dressing room?"

He said, "I am not at liberty to say, but I can say this: I thought I knew all the cuss words, but he had some I never knew existed."

Since the days we had that third philosophy of sports, life has taught me a mellow view of things, and it may be useful to you. I would like to tell you briefly about it. I think I can best illustrate by telling you about some friends of mine, a highly respectable family in suburban Washington, D. C., who sent their daughter to California to college.

At midterm they received a letter which said:

"Dear Mother and Father:

"I have lots of news to tell you, but before you read any further, please sit down.

"Now, are you well seated? Here goes.

"First of all, I am going to have a baby, but it is all right. The man has promised to marry me. Father, you admire enterprise, so I know you are going to like this man. He is the head of our campus unit of the Black Muslims. Mother, you like the home-loving type. He is that type. He has a project planned for Washington, D. C., in the middle of next summer, and would like to use our home. I told him he could store his bottles and gasoline fuses in the basement if he so desired."

But at the bottom of the page was PTO, please turn over, and on the other side was:

"Dear Mother and Father:

"Not a word on the other side I wrote is true. I thought it was best to get you in the right frame of mind to hear that I got two 'F's' in my midterm examination."

Promptly by return mail the daughter received a grateful check for \$500 for only getting two 'F's."

Now, the moral of that story, ladies and gentlemen, and all of you people of excellence, is: Don't be too darned good. Leave a margin for mediocrity you may have to fall back on sometime.

Well, it is now my pleasure, ladies and gentlemen, to introduce someone who did not share that philosophy. He leaves no margin for failures. He has proved it on the football field. He has proved it in the classrooms, and in Asia—if I may jump to one of my conclusions—where I believe your soldiers are doing for Asia what Churchill did for the Western world by holding out and buying time. He proved his excellence.

To introduce the winners of the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarships, it is my pleasure to introduce Major Peter M. Dawkins.

**Major Peter M. Dawkins** (U. S. Military Academy): Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. Mr. Plant, Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great pleasure for me to be asked here today to introduce representatives of the Postgraduate Scholarship winners this year.

This Scholarship Program has been in existence for four years, and I have been very privileged to have been a part of it for that period of time. I can assure you that those of us on Dean Woodruff's committee do not have an easy task. In fact we have great difficulty deciding who will receive those scholarships.

I would like to clarify that the reason we have great difficulty is not because we are worried that there won't be an adequate number of young men to fill the spaces we have available, but rather we have extreme difficulty in coming to any kind of agreement on which of the candidates should receive the scholarships. This results in very lively committee meetings, but I can assure you that kind of problem is very gratifying to have, and I am very certain we shall continue to have those very same difficulties in the future.

Warfare was once defined as the extension of diplomacy by other means. I think collegiate athletics may be defined in that way, too, as an extension of learning by other means. It is this partnership between scholarship and athletics which to me is the real essence of our collegiate theme today. I think the NCAA can be very proud of the part that the Postgraduate Scholarship Program plays in demonstrating this partnership and also be proud of these young men who personify what is truly great in the area of young people in this country and who do personify the integration of excellence both on the athletic field and in the classroom.

I would like to introduce the several winners who are with us today.

The first is Kenneth Zagzebski of the Air Force Academy who is a defensive guard, a young man whom I had occasion to watch this year during a very cold and seemingly endless afternoon in Colorado. He led the team in tackles for two years. You will have some indication of the type of athlete he is when I announce that he started every game for three years. But in addition to that, he

also possesses the top grade point average in his class for civil engineering majors.

Sitting with him is Alan Bersin of Harvard, who was an offensive guard, and had a grade point average of 3.5 in Government. He was selected as All-East guard this year and was offensive player of the week. In addition to his athletic exploits he also is secretary of Kirkland House Committee, vice-president of Pi Eta Society, and Second Marshal of his class.

Also with those two gentlemen is Dick Starbuck of Norwich University. He is a defensive back studying Business Administration. Not only is he a fine defensive back but also, interestingly enough, the captain of the swimming team and a standout on the track team. I am particularly pleased to note that he is also the ROTC Battalion Commander, as well as president of Alpha Kappa Psi.

At the same table is Ben Mortensen, of the University of Pennsylvania, who is majoring in Chemical Engineering. He is an offensive guard and is determined by the boys to be the best blocker on the team. Three times this year he has been selected as player of the game. In addition to his football activities he is also a member of the Sphinx Senior Honor Society.

On the dais here we have two additional winners. The first is Keith Miles of Trinity College. He is a quarterback who very interestingly averaged over 6.5 yards per carry. This may be explained by the fact that he is a Psychology major. Even more than that, he is also president of the student body and the president of the student senate.

**Keith M. Miles** (Trinity College): In behalf of the recipients representing the College Division, I would like to thank the NCAA for this great honor. I am sure I speak for all eight recipients when I say this is one of the finest awards any athlete could hope to receive in his college career.

In accepting this award I would like to take the opportunity to commend the NCAA for the tremendous work it is doing in improving the quality of intercollegiate athletics and the quality of the men taking part. It is largely through the supervision of the NCAA and the cooperation of the member institutions that the 33 individuals honored here today are not 33 football players who happen to get good grades but 33 intelligent students who happen to enjoy playing the game of football.

In behalf of the recipients from the College Division, I am sure I express the sentiment of everyone here when I thank the National Collegiate Athletic Association not only for this fine award but also for the exceptional job it is doing for intercollegiate athletics, a job which makes me more proud today that I have had a part in intercollegiate football.

**Major Dawkins:** Finally, I would like to introduce a young man I know very well. I must say I am very pleased to see Bud Neswiacheny here as a recipient of a Postgraduate Scholarship. Bud was our team captain at West Point this year and a fine defensive tackle. In addition, he is a lacrosse letterman. If you don't understand all the intricate details of West Point rank insignia, the stripes which extend from the shoulder to his elbow indicate

that he is training officer for the Second Cadet Regiment. It is a real pleasure to introduce Bud Neswiacheny.

**Bohdan Neswiacheny** (U. S. Military Academy): Thank you very much. It is a great honor for me to be here today and represent the athletes of the University Division who are receiving scholarships. On behalf of these young men, I would like to thank the National Collegiate Athletic Association for giving us the opportunity to further our education.

Speaking from my own personal experience, I find it very hard to put feelings into words. Football to me is more than just a game. It has given me more than I ever thought would be possible. My football playing days ended in December, but football will always be a part of my life. Today, thanks to the help of the NCAA, it has given me and several other athletes the opportunity to go to school.

**Toastmaster Smith:** Ladies and gentlemen, have you ever noticed how the state of Ohio performed for the United States what Great Britain performed for the world? For a couple of centuries it supplied all the other states with population. Everybody seems to come from Ohio—Jack Paar, Clark Gable, and six or seven Presidents, more than Virginia. I have often thought how flattering it is for Ohio to have so many distinguished sons. So on occasion I thought also, maybe all those people leaving the state of Ohio know something about Ohio that we don't know.

It is my distinct pleasure to call on a very distinguished son of Ohio, who was born there, studied there, graduated from college there, and was the attorney general of the state of Ohio, and who lives in New York—the Chairman of the Board for the General Telephone & Electronics Corporation, Mr. Donald C. Power.

**Donald C. Power** (General Telephone & Electronics Corporation): Mr. Smith, Mr. Plant, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have the honor to talk to you and honor these twelve gentlemen who distinguished themselves in college athletics and then went on to greater things in various fields of business.

It seems to me there is a message here for some of the members of the younger generation who seem to feel you can earn a varsity letter by chairing a protest group or trying to start one on the campus.

I am going to make these introductions very brief. I do not want to give the impression that any one of these is a greater leader or a greater athlete than any of the others, because earning a varsity letter for any reason is an enviable achievement. I thought I would not make any reference to scholastic standing or extra-curricular activities. We do have Phi Beta Kappas and some who spent all their time in the library.

The first one, Hulbert Aldrich, Yale, 1930. Vice-Chairman of the Chemical Bank of New York City. Received varsity letters in both football and basketball.

Rex Allison, University of Kentucky, 1931. Senior Vice-President of Allied Stores. He received his letter in riflery and also was active in tennis. I hasten to say he continues as an active tennis player.

George Champion, Dartmouth, 1926. I thought he was older. Chairman, Board of Directors, Chase Manhattan Bank. I can do that without reading. He received his letter in football and was a

member of the undefeated team of 1925, the National Champion of that year.

Lawrence F. Fiske, Colgate, 1934. Vice-President and Treasurer of Moore & McCormack Company, Inc. Received his varsity letter in football and played pro football for one year after graduation.

Harry D. Glenn, Westminster (Pa.) College in 1941. He is Vice-President of Uniroyal Consumer, Industrial and Plastic Products Division. Received his major letter in tennis.

Fred M. Kirby, II, Lafayette College, 1942. Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Alleghany Corporation, letterman in football, swimming and wrestling; a real triple threat in more ways than one.

Roger Lewis. Roger and I are in the same line of business. Roger Lewis, Stanford University, 1934. President and Chairman of General Dynamics Corporation, distinguished himself in soccer and rugby.

James Linen is another old friend of mine. Williams College, 1934. President of Time Incorporated. Three letters in golf. He started and developed at Williams and still possesses a very low handicap.

William May, University of Rochester, 1937. Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the American Can Company. A letterman in football.

Ralph T. McElvenny. President of the American Natural Gas Company, and distinguished himself in tennis, both at Stanford University and nationally. Class of 1928 at Stanford.

J. Henry Smith. University of Delaware, 1930. He is president of The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, and was letterman in soccer for three years.

Finally, Charles C. Tillinghast, Brown University, 1932. He represents one of the best airlines. He is President and Chief Executive Officer of Trans World Airlines. He has varsity letters in football, basketball and lacrosse.

Once again, I join you in saluting these gentlemen for their achievements in athletics and the great standard they have achieved in the field of business.

**Toastmaster Smith:** Ladies and gentlemen, you cannot get anything for nothing, even from the NCAA. Somebody has to pay for all those honors, and who better than a banker and a man with the apt name of Champion, the Chairman of the Board, our friend at Chase Manhattan, Mr. George Champion.

**George Champion** (The Chase Manhattan Bank): Mr. Smith, Mr. Plant, Honored Guests: I am sorry that Mr. Smith gave Ohio such a standing. We of Illinois never felt its standing was up to ours at all.

I feel like an imposter being here today, when I see the academic standing of these fine young men who are receiving these appropriate awards, although I do have a matter of fame of which I am very proud. Three years ago I received a letter from my third-grade teacher saying that I was the smartest student in the whole school at that time. That was not just one grade, as many of my friends have anticipated. This was first grade through high school. It was a matter of four rooms, not too crowded.

And as I remember it, my parents never gave me great accolades

for the report cards I brought home even at that time. My professors from then on were not quite as bright as this fellow, and I didn't get a Phi Beta Kappa key by quite a margin.

On the other hand, when I read the accomplishments of these young men, as long as Brother Smith is bringing this up, I would like to say this is just the prescribed background for those who want to enter the training program of that "friendly loan company downtown." I have to get in a plug once in a while.

Now, as a senior and most decrepit member of this otherwise distinguished group of former athletes, I am pleased and flattered to acknowledge the generous tribute which the National Collegiate Athletic Association has paid us this afternoon.

If my business colleagues here on the dais feel anything like I do, I think the term "former athletes" is well chosen. I am sure that nobody here would make you forget Bryan and Dowley, or participate in any bowl game other than as perhaps in a position of safety man in front of the old home television. In fact, if you were to poll our group on the biggest difference that we notice between our college days and now, we would probably confess that it takes us longer to rest up than it does to get tired.

In a sense we represent an earlier generation of colleagues who found it more fun to burn up the track or the baseball bat than to burn up the draft cards.

But I am happy to say there is no generation gap when it comes to acknowledging the value of competitive athletics. The lessons of good sportsmanship, teamwork and discipline learned on the athletic field remain enduringly relevant as a man moves into the field of business and industry. In my judgment there is no finer training in how to work with others, how to grow in that priceless inner reserve that each of us has, how to take victory with magnanimity and defeat with grace.

I know I speak for all my colleagues in the corporate community in thanking the NCAA for a memorable reminder that while collegiate athletics, like business, has its occasional frustrations it also has its heartening rewards.

Gentlemen, you have given us a very memorable day which we will always remember. Thank you very much.

**Toastmaster Smith:** Gentlemen, I have been given an agenda on which the next item says simply "Surprise." And I am allowed to administer the surprise. I have said so many derogatory things about Ohio that we felt I should make up for them by including the man who presented those awards among the award winners—Mr. Donald C. Power.

The high point in the Annual Luncheon, as you know, is the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, named after that American who translated the strenuous life of sports into public service more effectively than any other in our history.

The recipient today is a very, very fine American indeed. His antecedents literally came over on the Mayflower. Some years ago he was overcome with the thought they had forgotten something, so he went back and got the Grand Challenge Cup of the Royal Regatta, won in 1914 by the Harvard Crew.

I asked some friends of mine in Washington how they would

summarize the life of Senator Saltonstall, and one of them said, "Forty-four years in politics, and he never told a lie."

He was governor of Massachusetts for six years, a United States Senator from Massachusetts for twenty-one years or twenty-two years. Two years ago he retired voluntarily from the Senate, though he could have won re-election, easily. However, one must admit that was the period when Massachusetts was the only state in the union which allowed its two Senators to remain candidates.

I have had the honor of moderating television debates in which Senator Saltonstall took part and have had the privilege of covering his activities in the Senate. I have had the privilege of having him as my guest at my home.

He has many fine qualities. Perhaps one of the most useful has been the quality of prudence and caution. It is said he once said to a reporter who asked him for his views on a matter, "No comment, and that's off the record."

But in these times, when civilization often seems a very thin veneer indeed, requiring but a scratch to reveal barbarism just beneath it, perhaps the best thing that can be said about Senator Saltonstall is that he is a very great gentleman.

To present the Theodore Roosevelt Award to Senator Saltonstall, here is your president, Marcus Plant.

(The assembly rose and applauded as the award was presented to Senator Saltonstall by President Plant.)

**The Honorable Leverett Saltonstall:** President Plant and Mr. Smith, Former Athletes, all of whom are at least sixteen to eighteen years younger than this grandfather, and Gentlemen, Present Athletes, and Gentlemen of the National Collegiate Athletic Association: May I say, as to what Mr. Smith so kindly said, that was a political necessity, and how far that comes from the truth, so that it is either not a lie or close to a lie is always a question which I will never try to answer. But I do appreciate what he said.

The friends you make in college athletics are the friends who stay with you, with whom you know you can always reminisce and who are some of the best friends that you make throughout life. So I do appreciate the honor of being here with you today. When Professor Plant called me, I accepted only too gladly, because I want to assure you that your athletic ability grows as the years go on, and when you are 50 years or more out of college you become some athlete in your early days in college.

I feel like what Mr. Smith said his son said to him, "What did you men do, run in rubber boots?" I think I played hockey for one year in rubber boots. I couldn't keep up with anybody, but I was lucky enough to shoot a goal that made it possible for Harvard to win over Princeton.

That night one of the regular members of the team and I were relaxing with a bottle of beer in the hotel, and he leaned across the table—that was Bill Classen, our great defense man and a friend of mine—and said, "If I were you I would hang up my skates and put my stick in the closet tonight." He was dead right. I should have done that.

I am honored to receive this award in the name of Theodore Roosevelt. I have read many of the books concerning his life. In his athletic career at Harvard, he was puny, he had some difficulty

as to whether he was fit to go to college. He made himself a boxer and built himself up nicely.

Then after college, as we all know, he went out to the Dakotas, after he lost his wife, and became a full-fledged Western cowboy with all the roughing and everything else that goes with riding in the early days of the 1880's.

Then you can remember, as I do, when he was President of the United States and he felt that the Army's cavalrymen were not sufficiently hardened so he took them out, I think it was on a 100-mile ride—maybe less than that but a very, very long ride—within a 24-hour period.

So he became a tough, energetic man, of great intellectual ability.

I say it is a high honor to me because he was a personal friend in college with my father. They sat at a table for three or four years, with ten or twelve of them regularly together at that time. Some 35 years after he left college his son, Archie, was married to a great friend of ours in Boston, and I went with many others to that wedding reception. The bride and groom were in one room, but the crowd was surrounding ex-President Roosevelt in the other room.

I watched my chance, and when the poor man was trying to get down a bit of ice cream, I went up to him and said, "Mr. President, I am Leverett Saltonstall."

He started right in and said, "I remember very well your grandfather, when your father brought me to his house for a Sunday lunch. Your grandfather stood up and said, as he was carving the meat, 'Mr. Roosevelt (rose-velt), what do you want, rare or well done?'"

"Your father said to your grandfather, 'His name is Roosevelt (rooos-velt).'"

"Your grandfather looked at your father and said, 'Mr. Roosevelt (rose-velt), would you like it well done or rare?'"

That was a conversation 35 years after he was in college.

I am honored because I follow former President Eisenhower. He was a great athlete and played football at West Point until he put his knee out, and in putting his knee out he almost sacrificed his military career, but he stayed on and became, as we all know, a great general and also a great lover of athletics, particularly golf.

I suppose the highest honor that I will have, that I will always remember, in politics was the opportunity to sit as one of the four senators in the Cabinet Room at the White House every Tuesday morning when Congress was in session and discuss the current problems with the President. Always shall I remember that I never heard President Eisenhower say, "What is politically the wise thing to do?" He always said, and emphasized, "What is the right thing to do?" And that is the spirit in which he carried on his government.

When Dr. Plant asked me to come here today, I couldn't help thinking of the Regatta in England, which Mr. Smith mentioned. We were lucky enough to go over there in 1914. We were the first United States crew to win the Grand Challenge Cup of Henley. It was a great day for us, and when we went up to the dock or up to the float to get out of our boat there was a waiter from the

Leander Boat Crew with eight glasses and two quarts of champagne. Dr. Jim came up and said, "You can't touch that now."

I said, "Of course we have to drink it because they are offering it to us."

I carried out my first act of diplomacy at that time because I insisted on our drinking the champagne that was offered by the Leander Boat Club.

So when the people were good enough to bring us up to Syracuse several years ago we got so enthused we decided we would try to go back if we were all still around on our 50th anniversary and row again up to Henley. We asked if they would receive us, and they said, "Yes, we will see you on the river at tea time, either Friday or Saturday."

I thought of course that when we went on the river we would have our own crew. Since it was 50 years afterwards, the loud-speaker would say who we were, and the English would say, "Yes, we are glad to see you," and give us a grand hand, and get the old fogies off the river.

Instead of that, they gave us a tremendous hand and we rowed around the river until a barge got in our way and we had a little difficulty turning around. We had pictures of us at the start and at the finish. The picture that day, for which I had to pay \$5.85, showed us relaxed, resting on our oars, and I at the bar had my hand up. I said that was a courtesy for me because there was waiting for us the Queen Mother, who insisted on staying until she saw us row.

I mention it because the Harvard Second Crew was beaten by the Russian Crew which was much the best on the river.

When we came into the dock that day with the terrific crowd, we had a hard time getting our shell out of the river, and the Harvard Second Crew, as I stated to Mr. Samborski because it didn't come out of the Harvard Athletic Association, presented us with two quarts of champagne, so we again had, 50 years afterwards, a toast to the English and so on, on the docks at Henley, and we told them we would be back 25 years later.

Unfortunately we have lost our coxswain, but otherwise we can still go on the river.

So, Professor Plant, it is a great honor for me to come here today. I think the two men we have mentioned—one the man for whom the award was founded, and the other one of our finest generals and athletes with a love of athletics—are the men I shall always remember, and that is why I appreciate being here.

Theodore Roosevelt was a great lover of conservation. While President he started our first conservation for saving our great parks and areas so that we could all enjoy them. The recreation that goes with conservation, the recreation that goes on in the open places in our cities and in our states is so important. That was encouraged also by General Eisenhower.

Finally, education. The gentlemen whom we honor here today are all fine athletes, and we are proud of them as athletes, but we are going to be even more proud of them as educated Americans who will carry on the life of this country that we have loved, that has been built up and will be carried forward by these men in the days to come.

Thank you ever so much.

**Toastmaster Smith:** Ladies and gentlemen, it is the custom to present a replica of this award to the institution which sired—an alma mater doesn't sire, I suppose which mated—the winner of it. You may know that Harvard University is the most influential educational institution in our politics today, right next to the South-west Texas State Teachers. To receive the plaque for Harvard, I will ask the director of athletics, Mr. Adolph Samborski to come forward.

**Adolph W. Samborski** (Harvard University): Mr. Smith, Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is truly a happy occasion for me to accept for Harvard University this award which is named in honor of a famous Harvard son, and which was presented to another famous son of Harvard.

In our university community, Senator Saltonstall is both an inspiring example and at the same time a grand tradition. To the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts he is a revered public servant because of the outstanding service he has rendered and also because, in the words of Kipling's poem:

"He is a man who can walk with kings,

Nor lose his common touch."

Harvard is highly honored and deeply proud to share this award with the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall. Thank you.

**Toastmaster Smith:** I hope that the men who have been honored here today will carry their awards with the same modesty I came to expect from an old gentleman I knew in England some years ago, whose activities I was assigned to cover for many years, and who happened to be the Prime Minister. It happened that a fighter pilot died heroically in 1945 and this pilot's wife was invited to the Prime Minister's home to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross.

The wife took her little boy with her, and on the way the wife told the little boy, "Today you are going to see the bravest man in the world."

Unfortunately, when they arrived the Prime Minister's wife had to apologize, that her husband was in bed with a cold and couldn't get up, so she had to preside, and that was done.

But the little boy was promised the most courageous man in the world and he was going to have it. While the ceremony was in progress he strayed out of the room, went up the stairs and into a bedroom. In the bed he saw an old gentleman with the proportions of Buddha, sitting up in bed, and wearing red silk pajamas. He was sitting there with a glass of port and correcting a manuscript, with a small table on his lap.

Finally the little boy summoned enough courage to say, "Please, sir."

The old man looked over his spectacles and said, "What?"

"Are you the bravest man in the world?"

The Prime Minister grinned and said, "Yes, I am. Now bugger up."

With that, I present to you your President, Mr. Marcus Plant.

**President Plant:** Ladies and gentlemen, as this memorable occasion approaches its close, it might very well occur to many of you that there has been one award that has not been presented.

We have with us one of the leading men in his profession who

ran second to an Olympic winner, of which we took no cognizance. So, Mr. Smith, if you will come forward, I have a plaque for you.

**Toastmaster Smith:** As a little boy who won a Sunday School prize said, "Well, I'll be damned!"

**President Plant:** I will now ask Jesse Lyons to come forward for the benediction.

(Following the benediction, the session adjourned.)

## BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Morning, January 10, 1968

The Business Session of the Sixty-second Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at nine o'clock, Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan, President of the Association, presiding.

**President Plant:** The Chair will entertain a motion to receive the reports contained in the volume entitled "Annual Reports 1966-67." (The motion was regularly made and seconded that the Convention receive the Annual Reports. It was put to vote and carried.)

There is also a report of the NCAA Olympic Committee which appears on page 65 of the Convention Program. We do not plan to have an oral presentation of that report, but the Chair again will receive a motion that the report be received by the Convention. (The motion was regularly made and seconded that the report be received. It was put to vote and carried.)

### 9. REPORT OF THE TELEVISION COMMITTEE

**William J. Flynn** (Boston College): Mr. President and gentlemen: The 1967 NCAA Television Committee shares with its predecessors the staunch conviction that continuing supervision of television by the national organization is an absolute prerequisite to the future welfare of intercollegiate football. The Committee believes that the ground rules for such regulation of telecasting must be constantly subject to readjustment when change will guarantee maximum protection for the thousands of contests being played throughout the season by all manner of colleges, or if revision will provide increased promotion of the original brand of football—the college game. In an age when television offers instant information on everything under the sun, the Committee recognizes the need to make full use of television in keeping college football in the forefront.

The 1967 Committee has no new recommendations to lay before the Convention above and beyond those embodied in the Television Plan for 1968 and 1969 which was endorsed by the membership in referendum less than four months ago, and in the modification of that Plan described by the foregoing Report in the sub-section titled "Award of Telecast Rights."

The 1967 Committee repeats an exhortation by the 1966 unit in which it urged the NCAA to continue efforts to persuade the Congress of the United States "to assist in the preservation of the substantial assets inherent in college and high school football and in other amateur athletics by providing them through the law of the land with genuine and effective protection from untimely competition from professional sports and their television on Fridays and Saturdays which are the traditional days for the conduct, respectively, of high school and college football."

Mr. President, we are extremely saddened by the death of one

of our Television Committee members this past year, Mr. James Corbett of Louisiana State University.

I move the report be received. (The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.)

#### 10. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

**President Plant:** Those with white badges are voting members. The alternate is entitled to vote if the voting member is absent from the room. When you stand, your standing represents one vote for the proposition or against the proposition with respect to which you are voting.

If you are representing both your institution and also an allied member, such as a conference, please raise your hand, and the teller will then count you as two votes, in accordance with your authority.

##### Principles Governing Individual Eligibility

**James R. McCoy** (Ohio State University): Mr. President, I would like to submit the first amendment (I-A on page 17 of the Convention Program) and present an amendment to the amendment, which is listed as Amendment 100 on the mimeographed sheets.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the proposed amendment to NCAA Constitution Article 3, Section 10. (The motion was seconded.)

Mr. President, I move the amendment of this motion in accordance with the material in circulated Amendment 100, which has the effect of eliminating "for a period to be determined by the Council if findings of the Council indicate that" and inserting the word "if." (The motion was seconded)

The intent of this amendment, Mr. President, is to fix responsibility on the student comparable to that now imposed on the staff member and the member institution by the NCAA enforcement program.

It is believed that the fixing of this responsibility should be carried out according to the regular method: first, determination and judgment by the institution, with approval or modification by the conference, if called for; and finally presentation and recommendation by the Committee on Infractions, if it proceeds to this point, with the Council then dealing with the recommendation of that committee.

**President Plant:** This is an amendment to the proposed amendment. It may be adopted by a majority vote. (The amendment to the amendment was adopted by voice vote.)

The amendment has been amended, and is now before us. (The amended amendment was passed, 202-0.)

##### Membership Accreditation

**Harry Arlanson** (Tufts University): Mr. President and Delegates: This is a proposal to amend Constitution Article 4, Section 6-(c) as follows:

"(c) Disciplinary or corrective actions other than termination of membership or suspension may be effected during the period between annual Conventions by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Council present and voting at any duly called meeting thereof provided the call of such meeting shall have contained notice of the situation presenting the disciplinary

problem. **If an active member's accreditation is removed by its regional accrediting agency, said active member shall be reclassified immediately as an associate member.**" (Bold type indicates language to be added.)

The intent of this legislation is to provide for automatic reclassification of a member if its academic accreditation is removed. In order to be reinstated for active membership, the institution must regain accreditation by the regional accrediting agency and then be subject to the regular voting procedure in the district concerned.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this proposal. (The motion was seconded.)

**Robert Meijer** (Parsons College): I would like to offer an amendment to the amendment as follows:

"If an active member's accreditation is removed by its regional accrediting agency, said active member shall be reclassified as an associate member by the Council by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting at any duly called meeting thereof provided the call of such meeting shall have contained notice of the situation presenting the accreditation problem. Further, said member shall be reclassified immediately as an active member if the member's accreditation is restored by its regional accrediting agency." (Bold type indicates language to be added.)

Mr. President and gentlemen, I move that the amendment to the amendment be adopted. (The motion was seconded.)

The intent of the amendment to the amendment is to take into account situations whereby accreditation may be removed by an accrediting association for other than academic reasons. We feel the intent of the original amendment is a very worthwhile one, and we support wholeheartedly the intent of the original amendment, but there are occasions when accreditation is removed for reasons not based on academic grounds. Therefore, we would like to have the Council be in position to consider that, so that the intent of the original amendment is indeed followed; that is, that the removal of accreditation be based on academic grounds.

The reason for the last portion is that the procedure to become reclassified takes a certain amount of time, and if the sole ground is the matter of the accreditation, the loss of accreditation and subsequently the regaining of accreditation, then we feel that it would be more efficient to have the reclassification restored automatically.

**President Plant:** The question is on the amendment to the amendment. (A voice vote left the Chair in doubt; a subsequent standing vote defeated the amendment to the amendment, 64-121.)

The question before us then is the amendment in its original form as it appears on page 17 of the Program. (The amendment was passed, 248-0.)

##### Amendments

**Harvey C. Chrouser** (Wheaton College): The reason for this amendment is to advance the deadline for the submission of amendments to provide more time for the NCAA office to prepare and circularize the amendments and more time for the members to study the proposed amendments. The date of circulation and the date of submission will be advanced approximately two and a half weeks.

Mr. President, I move its adoption. (The motion was seconded and passed, 267-0.)

Item B, on page 18 of the Program is a proposed amendment to the Bylaws and is similar to the previous amendment to the Constitution. It likewise advances the date of submission and circulation of proposals approximately two and a half weeks.

I move its adoption. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

#### Transfers of Membership

**Anthony C. Morella** (American University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment to Bylaw 1-4(c) to transfer the American University of Washington, D. C. from District 3 to District 2. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

**Carl Abner** (University of Louisville): I move the amendment of Bylaw 1-4 that the University of Louisville be moved from District 3 to District 5. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

**J. William Davis** (Texas Technological College): As vice-president of District 6, I will make a motion, on behalf of the University of Albuquerque, to amend Bylaw 1-4 to move the University of Albuquerque from District 6 to District 7. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

**Richard W. Burns** (University of Texas, El Paso): Mr. President, I move that the Bylaw 1-4 be amended to transfer the membership of the University of Texas, El Paso, from District 6 to District 7. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

#### Committees

**Arthur Reynolds** (Colorado State College): Mr. President and delegates, this is a package deal to make some changes in the dates on which committee members take office.

Bylaw 3-1 currently provides that certain terms shall commence upon the members' election. That will be deleted. The terms of the Executive Committee members will begin immediately following the Convention.

The Eligibility Committee is appointed by the Council at its October meeting, and the members would take office the following January 1.

Members of the several general committees—the Extra Events Committee, the College Committee, the Olympic Committee, Constitution and Bylaws Committee, the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports—would take office September 1 following their appointment by the annual Convention in January.

The reason for those proposed changes is that so often several months elapse between the time the committee member is notified of his election and the time that he indicates he will or will not serve. It would be helpful if the committee members did not take office until September 1.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the entire group of changes. (The motion was seconded. Hearing no objection, the Chair permitted the amendments to be voted upon as a group. They were passed, viva voce.)

**Ernest B. McCoy** (Pennsylvania State University): Mr. President and delegates, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the

membership of the Gymnastics Rules and Meet Committee from six to seven.

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of this amendment. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

Mr. President, the second part of this amendment is to indicate that the committee shall consist of seven members instead of six, and that a director of athletics shall be named as a member of that committee.

I move the adoption of this amendment. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

**M. R. Clausen** (University of Arizona): The amendments to Bylaw 3-2 and 3-3 are proposed to conform these sections with the provisions of the Constitution 4-3-(c).

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this amendment. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

**Adolph W. Samborski** (Harvard University): Paragraph D on page 23 of the Program seeks to amend Bylaw 3-3-(b).

The intent of this amendment is to eliminate earmarking of committee positions for representatives of affiliated organizations. It does not preclude the appointment of a member of the National Association of Basketball Coaches. As a matter of fact, the NCAA Council will urge that the Committee on Committees include one, but as you note the intent is to eliminate the earmarking of committee positions for representatives of affiliated organizations.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this amendment. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

**Marshall S. Turner, Jr.** (Johns Hopkins University): Mr. President and delegates, the purpose of this amendment is to take account of the fact that the College Division Basketball Tournament has increased in size and the present committee of four is not sufficiently numerous to handle the problems that have arisen. This amendment, therefore, would increase the number of members from four to six, one of whom shall be elected from each of the NCAA College Division regions. The term of the chairman may be extended from four years to six years.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this Bylaw amendment. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

#### Eligibility Rules for NCAA Events

**President Plant:** We come now to Section VI, on page 24 of your Program, and with respect to Amendment B, the Chair would draw your attention to the fact that Amendment A was circulated to the membership in the Official Notice, but because of some drafting problems, Amendment B was placed in the Program. It is the wish of the Council, subject to objection from any delegate on the floor, to withdraw both A and B, pending a report to be made later in 1968 by a special committee which has been appointed to study the relationship between the NCAA and the junior colleges. The committee was appointed relatively recently. Its assignment was expanded and it has not had an opportunity to function. This will give this committee an opportunity to make this study, with the understanding that it will report back during 1968, so that the entire subject will have been explored by the Council prior to the next convention.

No objection is heard, and for that reason Amendments A and B, under Section VI on pages 24-25, will be considered withdrawn.

### Freshman Rule

**Milton F. Hartvigsen** (Brigham Young University): Mr. Chairman and delegates, it is proposed that we amend Bylaws 4-1-(d) and (e) and 4-2 as indicated on pages 25 and 26 of the Convention Program.

The intent of this amendment is to render freshman students eligible for all NCAA events, except in the sports of football and basketball, and for four years of participation in such events, provided the freshman year is one of the four.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this amendment.

**President Plant:** Before the Chair accepts a motion, is there objection from any delegate to considering paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Amendment VI-C together?

Hearing none, the Chair will accept the motion. (The motion was seconded.)

**Mr. Hartvigsen:** In the interest of the Western Athletic and South-eastern Conferences which are proposing the amendment, I would like to take a few moments to review a few matters relating rather specifically to the proposal.

First, this amendment was proposed a year ago, and following the vote, which was a very close one, a number of school representatives approached me and asked for a rehearing on this occasion, inasmuch as they had not had sufficient time to analyze the content and the implication to their full satisfaction. Therefore, a study has been conducted over the past year in which a number of conferences have participated as well as institutions on an individual basis.

The proposals that are being made in support of this amendment lie in the areas of educational concern, athletic concern, financial concern and the right of student choice in his educational experience. Therefore, I respectfully submit to you that this amendment is in harmony with the stated educational objectives and fundamental policy of the NCAA as stated in Article 2 of the Constitution.

Second, it is an extension of the presently established policies which have been applied to colleges having an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250, and therefore has been accepted in principle.

The third point that the sponsors would like to submit to you is that this is permissive legislation and not mandatory legislation. It is not intended that this affect negatively any presently established freshman competition or to negate that opportunity, but it is rather to give schools which have students who have qualified themselves for this opportunity, access to experiences for which they are presumably eminently prepared and, especially in the spring sports, an opportunity to make their selection under the guidance and wisdom of those who give them direction in their educational affairs.

It is demonstrative of the principle of the student's right to participate in educational activities in which he has established capability and quality, and this opportunity then is supported in a manner commensurate with that preparation.

The committee wished me to call to your attention that in the past few years there has been a decided change in the social structure of the society, as well as that of school admission policies. It is recognized that the 1.600 rule has a decided effect on the capability

of students who are entering the university, and that we no longer are dealing with a great variety of abilities and preparedness for these kinds of experiences. Most of these athletes have now had wonderful training and experience in the junior high schools under fine, capable leadership, and educational training on the high school level. A good many of them are well prepared for challenging athletic experiences as well as educational experiences on the university level, and the proposal is not to deny them the experience but to afford the opportunity provided the qualification has been established by them.

Additionally, they have had a number of fine experiences in summer activities and recreational programs. These youngsters have had broad academic training, social training, and are mature in more ways than one. Therefore, it has been deemed this should not be denied them, providing it is their desire.

We have had some experiences in the past few years with outstanding athletes who have sought an answer to this challenge in institutions and in agencies outside their own university-sponsored meet. We felt this is not in the best interest of the student.

We have learned by use of certain studies made in institutions which some of you represent that students do equally well, or even better, academically when they are attached to the athletic program than they do when they are not.

We find in the conduct of athletic programs, because of ease of transportation, jet travel and other arrangements, that the time away from school is not as it was years ago. Very little time is really required for travel and for competitive experience in this particular regard.

Some have suggested that this would only be an aid to the so-called super-star. I would suggest to you, on behalf of the committee, that this is not necessarily true. It also applies to that great bulk of student-athletes who probably ride the bench or do not get to participate following the first of the year and even during the freshman year, where little opportunity is provided.

I realize there are geographical differences in the United States, where certain institutions find it almost impossible to travel distances with freshmen teams, they are forced to with varsity teams. It is not a new experience for certain schools to transport, for example, certain teams in the spring—such as track and baseball and golf and tennis—for competition at a cost of four or five thousand dollars for one event in order to gain competition. In another geographic area it is very easy to find a dozen or so competitive opportunities. Therefore the financial costs in this area become quite important.

It has been suggested also that the students fail to be considered adequately on this level, and that fewer students would have an opportunity athletically. The experiences of our groups who have been analyzing things find this is not particularly true. It is altogether possible with the distribution of athletes among all the institutions, and especially in the interest of the College Division, that there will be more athletes participating in the program.

The smaller colleges and schools in the College Division which have tried this program have reported to the committee that for the first time they have been able to field a full team in each of the spring sports.

It is suggested that these people ought to have the same opportunity to participate in athletic programs without inequity. It is the conclusion of our committee that educationally and athletically there are no inequities in the proposal. It is entirely permissive, and it is not intended that this proposal do away with the freshman competition.

We have financial difficulties in many areas of sport, especially in smaller schools which have to travel long distances for competition.

Because of these reasons and the right of student to have access to educational and athletic opportunity, it is recommended by those sponsoring this particular amendment that he be given this opportunity without disrupting the present program. Thank you.

**Edwin H. Cady** (Indiana University): Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the speaker tell us why all these various persuasive arguments do not apply equally to football.

**Mr. Hartvigsen**: That is a very good question, and our committee is convinced that probably they do, but as you know there are those who feel that the student should not jump into a high-pressure sport as soon as he registers. They would vote against the entire amendment due to this one factor. There are many who feel their questions should be answered in the affirmative, but our committee has decided it should not be made a part of the package, but that it may be done at a later date, pending the experience of this proposal.

**Earl C. Lory** (University of Montana): I should like to emphasize to the membership again that is is permissive legislation. In certain areas, such as the West, you have to travel a thousand miles for competition, which some institutions find an impossibility. We are asking for the opportunity to use freshmen.

**Ernest C. Casale** (Temple University): Has there been approval of the Council, and if not, why not?

**President Plant**: The Council voted not to sponsor the amendment, but it did not oppose it.

**Frank Carver** (University of Pittsburgh): Speaking against the motion, our institution believes that we are trying to encourage more youngsters in all the sports and have more participation. We are now faced with the problem, because neighboring conferences have adopted this permissive legislation, of competing against them. We have said that we will compete, that your freshmen may compete in these sports, but only for three years. If this legislation passes, I don't believe we can ask this any further. I think this defeats the purpose of the NCAA.

**A. M. Coleman** (Southeastern Conference): In response to the statement made by our good friend, Frank Carver, we have used freshmen in the Southeastern Conference for one year, and we are certainly pleased with the result. Although it may seem a paradoxical statement, it does not necessarily decrease the cost of participation. It may in some instances make for economy, but it makes more effective distribution of funds.

In effect, I am saying that it helps the sports program. We now have full representation in our particular conference in the spring sports. A number of institutions have added sports, for example, wrestling, which is not a conference sport, boxing and soccer.

We feel it has made for an effective distribution of funds and the money that is saved is used to provide better facilities.

Perhaps we use fifteen players on the freshman baseball team, and maybe four or five or half a dozen of those the next year. What actually happens to those nine or ten boys? They find their way into some other activities. It seems a wider distribution of activities is offered in the beginning, and although they perhaps lose that one year of baseball, something is going to happen to them anyway. They will be somewhat disillusioned unless we happen to be in a mood to provide a junior varsity program, and not many of our institutions make that provision.

The people who will participate in the programs on the varsity level are, generally speaking, under the present NCAA rules prevented from freshman competition on the varsity level. This provides for a year and a half before they are eligible for the varsity team in the spring sports.

**Mr. Turner**: I am rising to speak to this from the position that many of the Bylaws of the NCAA which refer to championship events have a way of finding themselves transferred into the intercollegiate eligibility rules of the institutions of the conference. This proposal has some basis in it for intercollegiate competition.

The comments that have been made missed an argument for in-season freshman participation as opposed to postseason competition, for instance, travel costs. If you don't have a freshman team you don't have very much cost, but if you are going to send a team to the NCAA or as part of the varsity group there is not very much cost there. So the in-season play I think should be kept somewhat distinct from the result of that.

Now, it occurs to me, if you are going to add to the NCAA competition a group of freshmen, it is somewhat analogous to the problem most of us face in intramural competition. If you have to let some of your expert athletes participate in the intramural program, it has been our experience, and others have reported, that it pushes down some of the others for whom you cannot find room, and it makes it tougher for the so-called average athlete to participate.

This is of some concern to the little institutions who occasionally have a group of individuals who are very good athletes. If the larger institutions are adding an additional group of freshmen to these things, it will push down the people from the smaller institutions.

I perceive, frankly, that this would create some real tough recruiting problems for the non-football and non-basketball schools. Freshmen will be able to participate at the national level, which would create some very natural advantages and it would be very tough in the non-football and non-basketball colleges in competition for these kids around the country.

I am not so sure that this has such good implications for over-all competition and growth of sports.

I follow Mr. Lory's comments, that they want this legislation so that it will be permissible to play freshmen in-season. There is nothing now to prevent an institution declaring freshmen eligible for participation in in-season competition.

**P. R. Theibert** (Brown University): The amendment won't affect

the schools below 1250 men. It would affect participation in a school like Brown. It isn't necessary to save money on grants-in-aid. I don't see how basketball can be excluded and hockey included, and I doubt if this has been explored by the conferences which proposed this amendment. To not allow the freshmen to play basketball but to play hockey seems very strange to me.

The boys do like to represent the institution and that is why we have the junior varsity program. If this amendment is passed, you will find freshman teams, junior varsity teams and an increase in costs over which many athletic directors have no control. You will find an increase in club programs which are going to create problems on the campus.

**Paul E. Ostyn** (University of Idaho): We allow freshman participation during the regular season of the Big Sky Athletic Conference. The University of Idaho used to be a member of a conference which did not. Frankly, we like the present rule much better. We feel it adds a great deal to our program and we are able to compete much better with freshmen being allowed to participate in those sports other than football and basketball, and we certainly would ask for the support of those other people for the passage of this proposal.

**George A. Hansell** (PMC Colleges): I speak for a school of about 1400 men, just over the 1250 cutoff. We are using freshmen. This amendment would permit us to have junior varsity teams where now we do not have enough freshmen for a competitive team.

**Edward M. Bennett** (Washington State University): It seems to me that it is not fair to the student to place him in varsity competition as a freshman because he has other adjustment problems without the training and competition schedule to face. Also, this brings the baseball player to the attention of the professionals that much sooner with the attendant pressures on an exceptional player.

**President Plant:** Is there further discussion?

This is an amendment to the Bylaws and it may be passed by a majority vote. The voice vote leaves the Chair in doubt, and we will have a standing vote. (The amendment was passed, 163-160.)

#### Competitive Designation

We will now consider amendment VI-D at the bottom of page 26 of the Program. Let me say, first of all, there is a typographical error in the recital. In the second line, where it says "September 1, 1967," it should say "September 1, 1968."

**Richard Anderson** (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I move to amend Bylaw 4-6-(a) with the insertion of the language in bold-faced type. (The motion was seconded.)

We have found ourselves in this conference in a position where we have over the years reduced competition in the University Division to certain sports.

It is an advantage to our conference to be able to choose in not more than three sports, as has been proposed, to compete in the opposite division.

**Wilford H. Ketz** (Union (N. Y.) College): I am chairman of the College Committee and I speak for that committee.

One year ago, in Houston, we placed in the Bylaws this provision: "A member institution, through process of institutional self-

determination, shall designate its athletic program as either University Division or College Division for competition in those sports in which the NCAA sponsors a national championship in each division."

This was approved by the 61st Convention by a vote of 191 to 70, and it was to go into effect this coming September. This amendment would emasculate that legislation before it has had a chance to become operative.

Looking on page 78 of the Manual, the classifications, I have found some 602 universities and colleges at the present time of which 133 universities and 355 colleges are in conformity with the legislation now on our books.

Therefore, 114 institutions deviate from a total program in one or another division. Of those, 54 deviate in only one sport; 21 in two; seven deviate in seven sports; and one in eight. This is a total of 83 of the 114.

Under the limitation of three, if everyone took the total three—and I am sure they would not—you would have a maximum of 342 deviations where at the present time we only have 293.

So actually the legislation reverts to the old rule which the College Committee felt should be changed. We now have nine national championships in the College Division with baseball going in. The members of College Committee have carefully considered this matter, and they are unanimous in their view that the legislation now on the books is good legislation, and that this proposal should be defeated.

**Dean S. Trevor** (Knox College): Mr. President, when this legislation was passed at Houston to go into effect next September, it was sponsored by the College Committee, the Council, and the Executive Committee, and at a recent meeting of the Council it was unanimously endorsed. I think it would be very regrettable if this amendment were passed. (The proposal was defeated, viva voce.)

#### 1.600 Rule

**President Plant:** We approach now a group of amendments having common subject matter, and before proceeding I want to convey to the Convention two pieces of information that have come to me officially.

If there is no objection, Amendment F on page 27 is going to be withdrawn. It was sponsored by the institutions named, which requested that it be withdrawn, but the request came at such a stage that the printer was unable to delete it.

I have been authorized to announce that at the appropriate time, Amendment G, proposed by the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, will be withdrawn, if there is no objection from any delegate on the floor.

With that in mind, we will turn now to Amendment E, at the top of page 27 in your Program.

**Frank Carver** (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, speaking as the president of the ECAC, because the majority of its members remain opposed to the 1.600 legislation, and without any further comment because the issue has been covered thoroughly over the past two years, I move that Bylaw 4-6 be amended by eliminating paragraph (b) and the following sub-paragraphs numbered (1) and (2) and including the "NOTE." (The motion was seconded.)

**Adolph W. Samborski** (Harvard University): I am chairman of the Ivy Group Committee on Administration, and we are members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

The main issue involved in our opposition to the 1.600 legislation is the final authority over eligibility, financial aid and admission. Under the NCAA Constitution, our faculty committees on eligibility; our faculty committees on financial aid, which is administered on the basis of need; and our faculty committees on admission have final authority over these areas, up to the point where we wish to be eligible for NCAA-sponsored events.

Here the 1.600 legislation is invoked. To comply with the 1.600 legislation is in effect to delegate final authority over eligibility, financial aid, and to some extent admission, to an outside organization. Such a delegation of final authority in these three areas is not acceptable.

Although we appreciate the intent of the 1.600 legislation, we hope some other way of gaining the same objective may be found.

**Arthur W. Nebel** (University of Missouri): I move the postponement of Amendment E until Amendments H and I have been considered. (The motion was seconded.)

As to the consideration of the substance of Amendments H and I, the delegates here should know and understand what the effect may be in the elimination of the 1.600 rule.

**President Plant:** The Chair treats this as a motion to postpone for a definite time; the definite time being at the conclusion of the voting on proposals H and I. Such a motion is debatable. It may be passed by a majority vote. The debate is to be limited, however, to the propriety of postponement, and not to go into the merits of the questions involved.

**Howard Grubbs** (Southwest Conference): Executive Regulation 1 provides that the order of business for the annual business meeting may not be changed without a two-thirds vote.

**President Plant:** The agenda is established by the Council, and if we were to change the agenda this would require a two-thirds vote. The Chair interprets this as a motion to postpone, which is considered to be different from a change in the agenda.

**Mr. Grubbs:** I suggest that the phrase used in the Executive Regulation was Order of Business. It seems to me that the order of business would be as printed in the Program.

**President Plant:** The question is postponement to a definite time. (A voice vote left the Chair in doubt. A standing vote approved the motion to postpone, 199-117.)

Is there objection from any delegate to the withdrawing of Amendment F? (No delegate raised an objection.)

The Chair has been advised that the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference wishes to withdraw Amendment G. Is there objection by any delegate? (No delegate raised an objection.)

**J. William Davis** (Texas Technological College): Speaking in behalf of the six conferences which have endorsed Amendment H, I thought a little bit about this parliamentary maneuvering which brought us before the gun first, but we are very happy to come first. I move the adoption of Amendment H, on pages 27 and 28. (The motion was seconded.)

Mr. President, there are two amendments to be considered.

The first is to restore a phrase which was inadvertently omitted from the printed text, the phrase being, "in the conduct of all of its intercollegiate athletic programs."

Mr. President, I am asking that this be treated as an editorial error.

**President Plant:** Is there objection to making the change? Hearing none, it will be treated as editorial.

**Mr. Davis:** Now, Mr. President, the other change is requested in Note 2. We are asking for a change for classification purposes, and we ask that it read as follows:

"The provisions of Note 1 shall not apply to any institution which conforms to the foregoing requirements prior to a date to be set by the NCAA Council."

Mr. President, the sponsors feel this would be a clearer statement with the same intent as Note 2, and ask without objection that this be amended.

**President Plant:** Professor Davis is asking unanimous consent to making this change. Any delegate may, by objecting to the change, ask that it be a motion to amend the amendment and that we have the usual vote. Is there a delegate who would object, or is there a delegate who would desire further explanation of the requested change?

Hearing none, the Chair will rule that by unanimous consent the language change suggested by Professor Davis has been made.

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment H as amended. (The motion was seconded.)

I do not intend to make a speech in behalf of this amendment. I think its merits are obvious. I would emphasize one thing; that with the withdrawal of all these other amendments or proposals, the convention is now safe with three clear-cut alternatives.

The alternative that I am proposing is in effect to eliminate the continuation of the 1.600, but to keep the predictability tables, in order to keep paragraph 1, and although we continue paragraph 2 it indicates that the maintenance or the continuation of the student-athlete's academic grades depends upon his institutional program.

I hope we are clear as to the alternatives that this presents. We have just postponed one of the other alternatives; to do away with the entire 1.600 process. The third one, which is going to be offered as Amendment I, is a continuation with some modification of it perhaps.

At the last convention there was enough sentiment expressed to show that had this been as unified, and had we been able to present the clear-cut alternatives that we have before us today, we might have carried this amendment. This is probably the most popular of the changes that we suggested, and the attitude of the convention last year and this year has indicated that it is time for a change, that there is considerable dissatisfaction and has been since the inception of this program.

**Bradford A. Booth** (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. President and delegates, it will be my responsibility, on behalf of the Council, a little later in the day to introduce Amendment I. Perhaps it would be sufficient at this point if very briefly I tried to point up to you some of the principal differences between Amendment H and Amendment I.

In paragraph 1, Amendment H substitutes Association-approved tables for the national table, and in paragraph 2 it leaves to individual institutions the prerogative of controlling eligibility, exacting only that the requirements be reported and that students be making normal progress. The latter, I submit, is a very slippery phrase, subject to a wide range of interpretations.

The Association-approved table would, of course, be lower than the national table, and thus, in the opinion of the Council, would subvert the purposes of paragraph 2 and its effect would be to negate the legislation as written.

The Council believes that a student should demonstrate a minimum level of academic achievement for participation. This has been set at 1.600, which some think is ridiculously low. However, in the interest of harmony and in the spirit of conciliation and concession, the Council has agreed to drop proof of scholarship for institutions which agree to operate on the national table.

We are entirely aware that many institutions are not fortunate enough to be able to meet this standard. We say to them simply, "Bring up a table that is valid for your institution and guarantee that you will not participate a boy under 1.600."

Amendment H says, in effect, "We cannot make 1.600 on the national table, but we still want to be relieved of the obligations of exacting 1.600 from our participating athletes."

In the opinion of the Council such an amendment would so weaken the 1.600 legislation as to render it virtually meaningless. The Council therefore opposes this amendment.

**Ross Smith** (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): If Amendment H is passed, will Amendment I be voted on?

**President Plant:** The Chair will rule that it will be voted on; that Amendment H, though it may become immediately effective, does not preclude further amendment by amendment which has been duly filed and circularized. So, if Amendment H should pass, we will then vote on Amendment I.

**Mr. Smith:** And if Amendment H should pass and Amendment I should pass, the more restrictive of the two would govern the Association?

**President Plant:** If Amendment H is passed we will then vote on Amendment I. When Amendment I is passed or defeated, we will vote on Amendment E.

The Chair would like to have the record show that the order in which these amendments appear is not treated by the Chair as the agenda. The order in which amendments appear is determined largely on their content. The policy of the parliamentarian and the director has been to put first the amendment which makes the most substantial change in the bylaw to be amended, and follow in order of decreasing severity. If, therefore, the Convention wishes to consider them in some other order, it comes within the ordinary parliamentary procedure.

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Chairman, this startles me a little bit. I don't object to it at all, and I think it is perfectly fair. The one thing we can always say about President Plant is that he is eminently fair in all of his rulings, but it occurs to me that this ruling which sets up the order of business in this manner means that if Amendment H is approved it would also be possible for Amendment I to

be approved, and that would leave us in the very strange position of having approved two things that are contrary to each other.

Let's be real sure that we vote for only one of these, and let's not vote for both of them. I would urge you again to consider very carefully your vote in favor of Amendment H.

**Lysle K. Butler** (Oberlin College): Mr. Chairman, may I suggest one way out of this dilemma would be to return to Amendment E and pass that one.

I speak for Amendment H on behalf of the Ohio Athletic Conference. I feel the necessity to review a few reasons why we have the 1.600 legislation and how much has been accomplished.

When this legislation was suggested to us more than three years ago, there were three reasons for 1.600 regulation. Those were to upgrade athletics, to provide a policy of competition, and third, to save recruiting money. There have been some rather vague promises about grading in two years, but actually nothing has happened.

It is also impossible to legislate athletic equality. There are too many factors beyond the NCAA control. Only the institution can control them. I will admit, however, there has been some relief for those institutions that recruit, and this is a plus factor, but this alone is not enough to offset the apparent weaknesses of the 1.600 legislation.

There are four major weaknesses in the 1.600 legislation. Some of this will obviously be corrected with the amendments that are on the floor and will come immediately following the one now under discussion. The 1.600 legislation penalizes many students and even teams because of the violation of even a single individual, and this frequently is in an entirely unrelated sport.

For example, if an institution permits a foreign student to run on its cross country team in his freshman year you may have to tell your good swimmer in the spring that he cannot compete in the NCAA meet.

It is frequently impossible to get a good prediction for the foreign students, many of whom are recommended to us by the State Department.

There is no flexibility in the 1.600 legislation. There is no allowance for hardship cases. I don't think the Council or this body itself is omnipotent enough to write legislation that has no exception.

In effect, the 1.600 legislation forces members to conform, even though the legislation only applies to competition in NCAA championships. The wording is such that it forces all to abide by this legislation, even though we think there should be individual differences.

We had some examples of this last year. You all recall that practically every issue of the NCAA News had a new interpretation in regard to the 1.600. Last spring we received notice from the NCAA office that we could not grant any scholarship help for summer school for anyone with less than 1.600. Two weeks later that was rescinded because some schools had already promised aid for summer school work. We have had five official interpretations already in this legislation. Two of these are about to be revised now, and three new ones are about to be added.

I submit, gentlemen, this legislation is so confusing and poorly conceived that we need to not only amend it but to reconsider the desirability of repealing it.

Mr. Booth spoke a few minutes ago about the slipperiness of returning eligibility to individual institutions. If you will check the NCAA Constitution you will find that the wording is taken exactly from the Constitution, and if that is slippery and subject to different interpretations, it is not the fault of the proponents of this particular amendment.

**Edwin Cady** (University of Indiana): I am not sure about having a quarrel with Professor Davis. Professor Davis is a very likeable man and it is hard to quarrel with him. I find it easy to quarrel with Professor Butler. This has been going on between Oberlin and Ohio Wesleyan for many generations in fact.

There are a couple of things that ought to be considered. It is a shading difference I want to consider with Professor Davis.

I find the position on a grade point average of at least 1.600 a little humiliating and the uneasiness of an institution about requiring 1.600 verges on disaster. In my opinion, 1.600 is getting pretty far down on the scale, and is a very minimal requirement, it seems to me. I find it hard to imagine that institutions of higher education should be questioning enforcement of so minimal a standard.

So I think I would say to Professor Davis, I don't really dislike your approach, but I like the other one a little bit better. It is not a question of good and bad. It is a question of good and better.

Now, as to Professor Butler, I guess most of the things that trouble him are rhetoric. He is continually pushing things into the extremes and absolute, continually saying what is black or white. There is a readiness to say that the evidence is not the evidence, that we do not really know anything about it after years of experience with this sort of thing, after years of study by the best equipped people we could find to study it. As a matter of fact, we do know a good deal about this.

My institution has been living with a slightly higher requirement than 1.600 for a number of years. I can tell Professor Butler, without the slightest equivocation, this has been a major blessing for our program. It has simply raised the sights of the athletes, so that the boy who thought perhaps he could struggle along with a lower minimum now finds that he has been raised to a higher minimum and that he is more easily inspired to soar way up to a 1.600.

Something has been said in this discussion of 1.600 legislation about the matter of institutional autonomy. I would like to say a few words about the word "autonomy." We have been made much aware in recent years of the problem of the autonomous child. The autonomous child simply withdraws from humankind and in so withdrawing fails to permit himself to become a human being. I was reminded of the ancient word for autonomous child, which is "idiot."

We do not live in a world which makes autonomy very easy. We are members one of another. We live in a country based on the notion of association, of federation. We live in an era of human rights, which finds it absolutely essential for people to treat with one another about their activities.

I am not sure about the real thought behind the arguments for autonomy, but I would suggest that it has obvious dangers in it.

**Ross Smith** (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I move that

we postpone voting on Amendment H until Amendment I has been considered. (The motion was seconded.)

**President Plant:** There is a motion to postpone, which is of the same nature and quality as the motion that was made previously, and it has been seconded. It is debatable as to the propriety of postponement.

**Robert H. Frailey** (American University): If a vote on Amendment H were followed by a vote on Amendment I, and let us assume hypothetically that both are adopted, would not Amendment I then supersede Amendment H in that they both constitute an amendment to the same section of the Bylaws?

Then would not the previously postponed Amendment E be in order, so that hypothetically if a delegate were in favor of Amendment H his position would be to vote for Amendment H, against Amendment I, and if he lost at that stage, then he could vote for repeal? Is that not correct?

**President Plant:** That is a precise analysis, I believe, and that is the basis upon which the Chair made his ruling.

**Mr. Frailey:** May I suggest that the motion on the floor now, respectfully, would not be in order, or not necessary at least.

**President Plant:** It may not be necessary, but it is in order for postponement.

**Mr. Davis:** Would I be correct in assuming if this postponement took place that Amendment H would be brought up immediately after consideration of Amendment I?

**Mr. Smith:** In view of the facts that have come forward, I will withdraw my motion.

**John A. Fuzak** (Michigan State University): Speaking as a member of the committee that worked on this legislation, I want to underscore what Professor Cady has said. Some very desirable results have come from this legislation. For example, a number of schools for the first time have looked at their approach to admission. This is an academic gain. They have approached it on the basis of studies that have been made by several testing services and have adopted a more appropriate way of judging the enlisting and selection of students.

It has been our experience over some years that our coaches generally oppose this type of legislation. I think they opposed it when we were considering its adoption. Now our coaches at Michigan State are all for it. They all agree that it has proved beneficial and has had some very positive results even from their standpoint.

Last year, I met with a roundup of administrators in the state of Michigan. There was some discussion, and curiously this arose. Their indication was that generally it had a beneficial effect in terms of student-athletes within the state. At one time the top athlete often felt if you are a good enough athlete you can make it, you can get in. Now they feel that the student-athletes, seeing this legislation followed on a national basis, were motivated and concerned about a better academic performance at the high school level.

I believe that Amendment I is far superior, and I know our committee unanimously agrees on this. We were consulted by the Council. We would urge that you adopt Amendment I.

(A voice vote on Amendment H left the Chair in doubt. A standing vote approved the amendment, 170-156.)

**Mr. Booth:** I move the adoption of Amendment I. (The motion was seconded.)

At each of its meetings this year the Council debated the 1.600 legislation. The amendment now offered is a result of our deliberations.

Paragraph (1) is very like that in Amendment H which we have approved. It substitutes, however, for the word "incoming" in line 4 of paragraph (1), the phrase, "during the first year in residence." It adds the words "at least" in line 6. It substitutes, in lines 7 and 8, for "demonstrable institutional conference or national experience tables," the phrase, "the Association's national experience tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables." But it does not greatly differ in effect from that in Amendment H.

Paragraph (2) substitutes for the word "participation" in line 3, the phrase, "competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics" which phrase spells out more precisely the one interdicted activity.

It then adds a wholly new provision: "except that this paragraph (2) shall not apply to institutions that use the Association's national experience tables or more demanding institutional or conference predictive formulae in applying paragraph (1). Such institutions shall be limited only by the official institutional regulations governing normal progress toward a degree for all students as well as any other applicable institutional eligibility rules, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member. These institutional or conference standards shall be filed in the office of the Association."

There is also added a second note: "Institutions now in compliance with Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(1) through use of the NCAA national tables or more demanding predictive processes may qualify for the exception in Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(2) immediately. In other cases, 4-6-(b)-(2) shall continue to apply to student-athletes recruited prior to compliance with the stipulations of 4-6-(b)-(1)."

It is the theory of a democracy that the electorate gets what it wants, and it is the practice of a viable political organization that it adjusts to the desires of its membership, finding a workable compromise between extremes.

The Council believes that the 1.600 legislation is in the best interest of intercollegiate athletics in this country, but some of our members for differing reasons feel they cannot live with it in its current form. We suggest a compromise which we think preserves most of the desirable features of the legislation, while lifting certain restrictions on institutional autonomy which some members have found galling. Specifically, the amendment preserves the ban on awarding athletic scholarships to students who predict no better than a D average and specifies that conference and institutional tables must be not only reported but approved.

But it recognizes that institutions which use either the national table or in some instances institutional tables which are more demanding have a class of students whose progress can be monitored on the local level.

It concedes to such institutions the prerogative of setting up their own eligibility rules, insisting only that (1) these students be making progress toward a degree, and (2) that an authorized institutional representative can learn what are, in fact, the eligibility

rules of an institution which enjoys the immunity promised to it in paragraph (2).

The Council believes Amendment I to be an intelligent solution to our common problem and bespeaks your vote in its favor.

Mr. President, I urge that this amendment be approved.

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. President, I want to remind that we expressed an opinion. I think the opinion has been correct. I think that should be the prevailing vote. I urge you now to vote "no."

**Earl M. Ramer** (University of Tennessee): I would like to join Bill Davis in urging you to vote "no" on this particular amendment, since you have approved Amendment H. I am aware of Council sponsorship of the amendment, and my fellow members on the Council are aware of my concern about the second paragraph in this Council-sponsored amendment. I would like to present that point of view at this time.

The second paragraph abolishes continuance of the 1.600 provisions only to those institutions which use the national table or a more stringent provision of some type. This is contrary, it seems to me, to the initial intent of the 1.600 legislation. It is also contrary to a fundamental principle of this association that is endorsed in the Constitution, Section 3, Article 3, and the one to which Lysle Butler of Oberlin referred. I want to read it.

"A student-athlete shall not represent his institution in intercollegiate athletic competition unless he has been admitted in accordance with the regular published entrance requirements of that institution; unless he is in good academic standing as determined by the faculty of that institution, and unless he is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a degree as determined by the regulations of that institution."

Moreover, many of our institutions having less stringent tables, and this is perfectly in keeping with the original intent of the 1.600 legislation, have very stringent admission policies, and they ought not to be discriminated against since they are not using the national table.

I hope, fellow delegates, we may join in defeating this particular amendment so Amendment H, which has been approved, may be sustained.

**Arthur R. Reynolds** (Colorado State College): I would differ with friend Earl. I think proposed Amendment I is preferable.

Earl does refer, as does Lysle Butler, to Constitution Article 3, Section 3, and the provisions for a student being eligible to participate in NCAA competition. If an institution did not wish to participate at all in NCAA events, it would not have to comply with the bylaw at all; it could use anyone that satisfies the provisions of the Constitution.

Now, 1.600 is not a particular high grade point level. We are not forcing anyone to accept the national table. This is purely permissive, so far as the second paragraph is concerned. Those who wish to use the national table for the predictive factor need not check the 1.600 requirements so far as the grades are concerned.

On the other hand, those who do not wish to use the national norm as a prediction factor, may still use the conference prediction table or the individual institution's prediction table, if it has been approved by the NCAA. They can still use that in admitting stu-

dents, but for the sophomore year we are merely saying that this student must maintain a grade point average of at least 1.600.

Now, again, this is a very, very low one. I don't think that we as academic people would want to have to apologize to the American people on the basis of saying that our student-athletes need not maintain at least what amounts to about a D-plus to remain eligible to play.

The original idea was that these students would be a sample of the male population on campus. I don't think we would say that most of the males on our campus are running below 1.600.

I strongly urge the adoption of Amendment I. I think it would be for the best interests of the Association.

**Francis E. Smiley** (Colorado School of Mines): I am also chairman of the NCAA Long Range Planning Committee. I would like to speak in both capacities.

Representing the Colorado School of Mines, I would urge the passage of Amendment I.

The Long Range Planning Committee, looked into the impact of the 1.600 rule, and it has recognized, as the Council has recognized, that some modifications seem to be in order.

The modification proposed by the Council comes closer to what the Long Range Planning Committee feels should be done. We believe that Amendment I is preferable to Amendment H. They are both good, but we feel this is preferable.

**Robert F. Ray** (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I should like to urge the delegates to this Convention to support the proposal now before them in the form of Amendment I. A very few years ago, as those responsible for the conduct of athletic programs in our institutions, we took a giant stride forward with the passage of the 1.600 legislation. What it does is simply require a continuing eligibility status of 1.600. What Amendment H does is to take that feature out of the legislation while retaining the requirement that the student predict that level in order to be eligible in the first instance.

I was particularly moved by a statement made yesterday at the luncheon by one of the students we honored with one of the scholarships. He paid tribute to this Association, not only because of the manner in which it conducted its athletic program, but in which it made every effort to strive toward excellence in academic as well as athletic affairs.

I hope this Association is not going to take a giant step backward now, after having taken a giant step forward. I urge the adoption of Amendment I, as a reasonable compromise.

**Clarence Von Eschen** (Beloit College): I represent ten small liberal arts colleges, and while we know there are some individual problems in this, it is the opinion of our group of colleges that the legislation is sound. I urge that it be passed. We do not feel it is unreasonable to expect an athlete to have at least a 1.600.

**Carl E. Erickson** (Kent State University): I hope in conclusion that I can answer my friend, Bill Davis. He stated that the facts have been given. I am not sure they all have. Lysle Butler's comments were not in keeping with the special report presented in January, 1965.

(A voice vote left the chair in doubt; a subsequent standing vote approved the amendment, 232-92.)

**President Plant:** We turn now to the matter that had been postponed to a time certain. The time certain has now arrived, and Amendment E, which had been moved and seconded, is now before us.

**Adolph W. Samborski** (Harvard University): Mr. Chairman, I move for a written ballot on Amendment E. (The motion was seconded.)

**Lysle Butler** (Oberlin College): Mr. Chairman, does our procedure indicate that upon the request of any member it is possible to have a roll call ballot taken, or is it subject to vote?

**President Plant:** The Executive Committee discussed voting procedure and decided that the Chairman first put the proposition to a voice vote. If in doubt, he can have a standing vote. If in doubt on that, he can have an oral roll call vote, but a motion for a written ballot would require a majority vote of the delegates. So the proposition now before us may be passed by a majority vote.

(The motion for a written ballot was defeated, viva voce.)

(Amendment E was defeated, viva voce.)

(The convention recessed at twelve o'clock.)

## BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Afternoon, January 10, 1968

The convention was called to order at 1:45 p.m., President Plant presiding.

**President Plant:** The afternoon business session of the Sixty-Second Annual Convention will be in order.

### Reconsideration of Amendments

**John W. Winkin** (Colby College): I move that we reconsider Amendment C to Bylaws 4-1-(d), 4-1-(e) and 4-2 which was passed this morning and I leave it to the discretion of the Chair at which point that ought to be done. (The motion was seconded.)

**Ross Smith** (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): For all the good that we accomplished this morning in amending the 1.600 rule to enable the membership to comply and also be consistent with educational packages of their own institutions I think we took the biggest step backward this Association has taken for some time. In spite of all that has been said prior to today to substantiate why some schools have real travel difficulties, if the majority of the members of this Association would bring freshmen into varsity competition it would curtail participation. It would amount only to the saving of bucks. It would primarily be a step in the furtherance of this Association as a sponsor of legislation primarily aimed at the financial end of administering our program. I think it would lead to a real neglect of spreading the benefit of athletics to the larger number of students who are involved in our program. If we have to make a choice between dollars and programs, I think the conferences like the Western and Southeastern can do this within their own conference. I think they have already done it, and this has been the spirit of our legislation, to have permissive things. Although it is a good idea for those who want it, when you subject 610 institutions to programs which are really detrimental to spreading the benefits of our program, I think it is a real step backward.

I urge everyone to support our prime purpose of furthering our athletic objectives.

**President Plant:** The motion has been made and seconded to reconsider. The earlier vote on this motion was 163 in favor of the motion and 160 opposed.

**Fred L. Miller** (California State College, Long Beach): This has already been voted on. Obviously there is a different population here. Some delegates may have left the particular session. I think the matter has been decided, and I see no purpose in bringing it up again at this particular afternoon session.

**President Plant:** The parliamentarian indicates this motion is in order, and it has been duly seconded. It is a debatable motion and the debate is not limited, although I suppose for the sake of order we ought to confine the debate to the advisability of reconsidering.

**Jesse T. Hill** (University of Southern California): Mr. President,

my institution voted against this legislation. Gentlemen, I feel reconsideration would be one of the greatest mistakes this Convention could make. The legislation has been duly circulated. Everyone has had an opportunity to consider it. Everyone has had an opportunity to caucus. The vote was taken. There were 323 votes cast; 163 for, 160 against. We will not have two-thirds of that number here this afternoon, and I think it is unfair to those delegates who voted and left this morning feeling this legislation was passed. In my opinion, it would be a very dangerous precedent, even though my institution's vote would be in the other direction.

**Mr. Smith:** I would like to agree with that point of view and suggest that a mail vote be circulated to those who registered at this Convention. However, my first call for reconsideration was on the weak system of counting the vote. I think it is something this Association has to correct another year. I don't think we can continue to deliberate over 200 votes in a matter of counting heads where one or two votes can decide a situation.

**Mr. Winkin:** My conviction is that everybody understood that the session was for the day and that we were expected to be here for the day, and these issues are in order if we want to reconsider them at this point. Therefore, I do not withdraw my motion.

**J. William Davis** (Texas Technological College): I agree completely with Jesse Hill's statement on this particular amendment. It would be very unfair to reconsider and possibly take advantage of the absence of a great many people who are not here this afternoon. As I look particularly at this area of the room, I see it is almost vacant. Yet it was almost full this morning. I suspect a great many of our people have gone home.

In the spirit of fair play, I don't believe it ought to be done.

**Jefferson Bennett** (University of Alabama): This is my fifth convention as chairman of the Athletic Division of Alabama. We lost a number of votes in the past five years, and we are concerned with it, but I must admit, in all our deliberations and the decisions reached, I have been impressed with the sense of fairness and obligation each to the other in building the program of American sports in the colleges and universities of this country.

If this motion carries, I would feel an obligation to express my personal feeling as a delegate here, that it has not been fair to our colleagues around the country nor have we been fair to our own procedure as outlined in the agenda. There were two items considered of major importance at this business session. They have both been voted on. The various alternatives to the question, as was pointed out earlier, were printed and distributed to the membership. The delegates were sent here at their colleges' expense for expression, debate, deliberation and to come to a conclusion. I feel an obligation to the people who are not here. As we look around the room, I think there would be a little more than one-third of our colleagues who are absent this afternoon. It would be a matter of deciding either along the line of their own convictions or on the vote they lost.

I would sincerely hope our sense of fair play, our sense of obligation each to the other in the development of sports in this country would at least see to it when a matter has been disposed of on our agenda and our colleagues leave, they can assume that that vote has been passed and that is that.

**Thomas J. Hamilton** (Athletic Association of Western Universities): It is with some trepidation that I speak. I don't know whether it is fair play or not, but I have had some interest, in fact, I talked to Commissioner Coleman in the corridors after the meeting this morning and he said he was ready to negate any arguments I offer. I figured if I got up to speak on this subject I would drive more votes to the other side, so I didn't.

But I am forced from a personal view, not affiliation or anything but experience in sports, to say I think the NCAA took a long step backward in this rule on freshman eligibility. This Amendment was passed because it encourages a lot of excellent competition. If this goes on, we seriously ought to consider changing the name of the Association to the National Collegiate Association of Recruited Athletes.

I have heard all this group, or many of them, get up in banquets and other places and say sports is such a great thing and we have this program, we want to take it as far as we can. But now in our American system we are taking away opportunities for kids who maybe were not good enough in high school. They sign with us, but they still like sports. They like to have a chance to continue. They have had that chance in the freshman program.

We have had experience with freshman eligibility in 1946 and 1951. I had the doubtful privilege of coaching during those years, and the standards of our play went down when we had freshmen eligible to play.

You are getting into a lot of problems with kids who have been promised they can play varsity the freshman year. By hard work they just cannot make it, and when they cannot make it that first year, they transfer.

The NCAA is going to have a lot of problems in this area. I don't know what you can do about it, but the action of the group this morning was in the wrong direction, and whatever they can do to change it, I think we ought to give consideration. Thank you.

**Marshall S. Turner** (Johns Hopkins University): Some of the arguments that have been made here should have been mentioned this morning before we took a vote.

Much as I agree that this is a big step backward, I feel I want to say something about the small colleges I have noticed in the 15 or 18 years I have been coming here. In the early fifties, when the smaller colleges were just beginning to be considered as members of the Association in many things, I noticed that many of the important pieces of legislation were always held in the late afternoon of the business session. The small colleges were limited as to budget so their representatives had to get out in the afternoon and in many cases missed the vote because it came late in the program.

The NCAA has gotten these things up so the majority of the tough decisions have been handled while the majority are here. I feel I would not like to lose this for the small colleges, even though I feel this is a step backward.

**Mr. Winkin:** I appreciate Admiral Hamilton's comments, but in view of the discussion that has gone on, I will withdraw my motion and propose that the issue be resolved in a mail vote to those who were registered for the convention.

**President Plant:** The Chair does not have knowledge of any

provisions of our Constitution and Bylaws for a mail vote in a situation such as this. The ruling therefore is that this suggestion is not in order.

**Mr. Winkin:** Then I have no choice but to not withdraw my motion.

(The motion was defeated, viva voce.)

#### NCAA Athletic Events

**Marshall Turner** (Johns Hopkins University): At the 61st Convention, approval was given for a College Baseball Championship. The amendment on pages 29 and 30 of the Convention Program simply sets up the machinery for the establishment and conduct of this championship by the College Baseball Tournament Committee.

In the Amendments to Amendments Bulletin distributed this morning, Amendment 104 is an amendment to the amendment being proposed.

I move the adoption of the proposed amendments to Bylaws 5-1-(a) and 3-3 to establish and administer the College Division Baseball Championship. (The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

You will recall this morning we passed a series of amendments which had to do with the terms of the members of the various tournament committees. This committee, under this procedure, would not become effective until September 1, 1968, following the conduct of the 1968 baseball tournament. Amendment 104, therefore, is to add a note that the 1968 College Baseball Tournament shall be administered by the persons elected to the College Baseball Tournament Committee by the Sixty-Second NCAA Convention. I move the adoption of the amendment to this amendment.

(The motion was seconded and passed, viva voce.)

#### Extra Events

**Stan Bates** (Washington State University): Mr. President, a year ago we amended Bylaw 7-A-1-(j) to require management of certified games to not contact the opponents before the Monday prior to the last game or the third Monday in November, whichever was the earliest.

We did run into difficulty with games scheduled earlier. I move the adoption of the following to be added to the last part of this paragraph:

"or, if the game is to be played earlier than the second weekend in December, such contact shall not be made prior to three weeks before the date of the game."

(The motion was seconded and approved, viva voce.)

#### Preseason Football Practice

**William R. Reed** (Big Ten Conference): Mr. President and delegates, it will be recalled that at the last convention there had been submitted three amendments in this area and it was quite apparent from the discussion on the convention floor that the subject is rather complicated and very confusing. The consensus was that action at that time be deferred. A committee was appointed to study the subject matter and to bring forth recommendations.

As though this matter were not sufficiently complicated in itself, the gremlins have had to take a part in further confusing matters, complicating the situation, as a result of which there was circulated

through a misunderstanding a preliminary draft of the committee's recommendations, which appears in the Convention Program as Amendment A. It is my understanding that Amendment B, which is the report of our committee, can only be considered as a substitute for Amendment A.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move for the approval of Amendment A. (The motion was seconded.)

I move substitution of Amendment B, as it appears on page 31 of the Convention Program, for Amendment A. (The motion was seconded.)

Mr. President and delegates, the intent and purpose of this amendment is twofold. First, it is proposed that there be provided for and that it be required that the first three days in the pre-season football practice period be devoted to non-contact conditioning drills. This feature of the proposal has been urged by the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. There was also represented on our committee an outstanding team physician and athletic trainer.

Second, it is intended by this proposal to minimize differentials in preseason programs which exist from year to year because of annual calendar fluctuations and which exist among member institutions as a result of variations in the elective state for the opening of the playing season or as a result of variations in academic calendars and the opening of classes for the fall term.

The basic features of this proposed amendment were well presented at the round table session on Monday. Because of that exposition, I will not seek to recapitulate them here. I would, however, seek to emphasize the basic approach to this complicated problem as it was explored by the committee and as it is reflected in this proposal.

There was contemplated what we thought of as an ideal or, as a panel member stated on Monday, an optimum preseason practice program. This would consist, barring any further complication, of a three-week period prior to the first game, two weeks of which would consist of twice daily drills, the final week of a single drill daily.

The options for determining an open date which are made available to the membership under this proposal, each assure us as a minimum that this format which I have described as an optimum preseason program is assured each institution, or there is available an equivalent of that precise format which it may be desirable to elect because of class calendars which in some way limit or eliminate opportunity for twice daily sessions for the entire two-week period which is contemplated in that optimum format.

**John A. Fuzak** (Michigan State University): I move adoption of Amendment 105 to the amendment.

The change applies to the paragraph beginning, "Physical activity," and amends this to read: "**It is strongly recommended that physical activity . . .**" The other changes are merely to conform grammatically to that change. (The motion was seconded.)

**Mr. Reed:** Speaking for the committee which has offered the current amendment, I can say that we welcome consideration of the amendment to the amendment which has just been read. We do not take a position on it, and we do not urge you to vote in favor of it or to reject it. We welcome consideration of it, how-

ever, because in developing the mandatory feature which is subject to the amendment now proposed, we were aware of certain shortcomings that might be seen in such a mandatory device. There is a question as to enforceability. There is a question as to its intrusion upon professional standards in coaching.

However, we do feel very strongly there should be some provision made for this period of non-contact drills, and we felt that if we were to put it in a permissive form it would be impossible for the Convention to move to a mandatory form. Therefore, we put it in a mandatory form, aware of the fact that it might be amended to be preferable in a recommended form or a discretionary form.

**Mr. Fuzak:** In terms of my personal observation, to make this mandatory is an intrusion upon the professional competence of our coaches. It is inappropriate to make a specific requirement of this sort. I tend to equate this with the kind of academic freedom of the coach. I would hate to see someone tell one of our professors the first three days have to be spent in warmup. It varies in various situations, and there are reasons why the strongly recommended proposal is as effective as the mandatory one and yet allows for some flexibility.

In these days of great concern with liability, when an organization such as this states that something is strongly recommended, and if the team physician says he recommends it, the coach may be in great difficulty if he disregards it. So "strongly recommended" is a more appropriate approach. It provides some flexibility and yet will have great force. Thank you.

**Frank Carver** (University of Pittsburgh): Speaking as a member of the Committee on Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, the amendment is contrary to the thinking of this committee. The Committee has been in existence about two years and has gone to a lot of trouble, a lot of time and a lot of study, at the request of this body, of safety factors and injuries when they do occur. It is the considered thinking of this Committee and also of the joint committee on this matter that the amendment as stated is necessary to have in the rule.

I would request, Mr. President, to have L. W. Combs, Director of Student Health Center at Purdue University and a member of this committee, speak to this body from the medical standpoint.

**President Plant:** Dr. Combs is not a delegate or an alternate, and does not have the right by himself to active participation in the affairs of the Convention. Is there objection to Dr. Combs addressing the Convention on this subject? (No objection was raised.)

**Dr. L. W. Combs** (Purdue University): This matter is of grave concern to the athletic team physicians and trainers throughout the United States.

In the summer of 1966, we met because of our concern about the fatality rate in football in the United States. We made the recommendation that you read in this amendment. Last year, for instance, 43 per cent of all the reported injuries occurred in the first three weeks of practice. Practically all of the fatalities from heat stroke or heat exhaustion in college football and high school football occur in the first few days of practice.

It was never our intention to attempt to interfere with the

coach's prerogative. It was always our intent to provide adequate time for the conditioning of the athlete. I would rather use the word *acclimation* of the athlete, rather than *conditioning*. The heat fatalities have occurred in the north just as much as they have in the south, and we know that the first few days of practice allow the athlete, regardless of his physical condition, to be acclimatized. We have felt that the coaches have the opportunity to have three days of acclimation of athletes in the contact drills.

Please believe that in no way does this medical committee or this training committee wish to jeopardize the prerogative of the coach in his choice of equipment, but we felt it was essential that this time be devoted to conditioning and acclimation and that the equipment stated within this amendment was satisfactory for that purpose.

**DeLaney Kiphuth** (Yale University): I would like to ask the proposer of this amendment to the amendment if he thinks this needs some clarification. I presume the first sentence is clear, "It is strongly recommended that," but the second sentence seems to dictate that no matter what you do, whether you accept the strong recommendation for no contact or not, you have certain restrictions on gear issued. I don't think that is the intent of the amendment, but that is what it says.

**Mr. Fuzak**: Certainly that was not the intent. It is not the intent to require, but to strongly recommend. That is the way I interpreted it. There was some question about how it was to be presented, and that is what was intended in this particular form.

**Ernest B. McCoy** (Pennsylvania State University): Mr. President and gentlemen, at the risk of taking too much of your time, I think it is rather appropriate that I talk to this point. I was appointed by the Council to head the committee which was originally named Injuries and Safety Committee, which spent eight years with three different surveys sent to the membership examining football injuries, and which reported to this Convention three different times. On each occasion, starting with the first one, we recommended that such a statement be placed in our rules, recognizing fully the great possibility that there was no strict enforceability on each campus, but hoping with such strong language to bring pressure to bear.

In the statistics just quoted, 43 per cent of all injuries that occurred during the entire football season this past fall occurred in the first three weeks of practice. The chairman of this committee, Carl Blyth, is present. He was on the original committee and, if my memory serves me correctly, we were within one percentage point of where we stayed during the first three studies, that is 43 to 44 per cent or 44½ per cent of all the injuries occur in the first three weeks of practice.

May I jog your memory for just a moment to remind you that this committee was created only because editorials were appearing all over the newspapers and other media, as well as television and radio, taking football apart, not only because of the fatalities that had occurred that fall but because of the numerous injuries. They asked where were the presidents of our universities, where were the athletic directors of our various institutions, wasn't the NCAA going to do anything about it, or should we get rid of this ball game?

You were concerned enough at that time to establish a com-

mittee which you underwrote for the next eight years and are continuing to underwrite, to try to find a way to cut down on these injuries.

One of the strongest recommendations we can bring to you is again appearing, and that is that something be in writing. The enforcement is something else again. I can only say to you that I appeared several times before the trainers' association and talked with the doctors. I appeared before many medical clinics and received the finest support that something should be done. This has been circulated and I would hope, in the interest of getting this off the ground, that we take these first steps and see whether or not it has the result that we hope that it will.

(The amendment to the amendment was defeated, *viva voce*.)

**Col. E. R. Heiberg** (United States Military Academy): Mr. Chairman, I have proposed Amendment No. 106 to the amendment which we are now considering. My recommendation is that a fourth paragraph be added as follows:

"(4) The fourteenth day before the first day of classes."

(The motion was seconded.)

Gentlemen, I would like to bring out the fact there are categories of dates that have been recognized by the Committee, and the committee has done a fine job in delineating more clearly than last year the dates on which practice should start. However, being among those few institutions which start their academic classes in the first week of September, we stand to lose by the amendment.

I would invite your attention, gentlemen, to calendar No. 3 on page 32 of the Convention Program. The Military Academy classes start the day after Labor Day in 1968, which is by law and I don't think I can get Mr. McNamara to change it, on September 3. There are many colleges under trimester systems which are supposed to start at that time.

We have one option, namely option No. 3, which limits us to 29 "practice opportunities."

It has been brought out by the committee that the optimum or ideal is for a college team to have two weeks uncluttered by academics—I think those are the words of Dr. Blyth—and as Mr. Carver indicated, a two-a-day practice schedule for two weeks is ideal. I think you can recognize from this particular amendment this ideal is denied those of us who start in the first week in September.

Now, let me take a college whose first game is on the 21st of September. It has the option, of course, of taking the twenty-second day before the next to the last Saturday in September.

What is the twenty-second day before the next to the last Saturday? Well, the twenty-first day is the 31st of August, three weeks previously. The twenty-second day, therefore, is the 30th of August. So College B, which starts its football season on the twenty-first, and has academic courses starting sometime that week, has the opportunity of two-a-day sessions on the 30th and 31st of August, that is, four in August, twelve the first week in September, twelve in the second week of September, which adds up to 28, and plus five on the final week, and that is 33 practice opportunities.

I will take another category; the college that begins its season on the last Saturday in September. I know that Tufts College is one of these. They would have not only the four in August, twelve

the first week in September, twelve for the second week in September, six opportunities in the third week in September, since they have no game, and five more opportunities in the last week in September, or a total of 39 practice opportunities.

So there we have College A, to which I subscribe, limited to 29 practice opportunities, and College B, starting on the next to the last Saturday, permitted to have 33, of which 28 are in the ideal situation, and of course the final category of the college starting the last day which would present the possibility of 39 practice opportunities.

If the purpose of this amendment is to make more equal pre-season football practice, I contend it is not more equal in the one group that cannot have the optimum period but is limited to 29 practice opportunities, whereas the others do have the opportunity for the ideal type of practice with as much as 33 or 39 practice opportunities.

**Mr. Reed:** Mr. President and gentlemen, the problem of the school whose academic calendar is such that classes begin in advance of the first game complicates any arrangement for preseason practice programming or any efforts to equalize it, although very honestly I do not think that our committee was attempting to equalize. As I said earlier, what we were seeking to do was minimize the differential which exists.

The committee deliberated at great length on the problem of the trimester school which opens classes at a date early in September or sometime in August.

One of the reasons that the committee abandoned what is in effect the proposal that is before you now in the form of an amendment to the amendment was that it is quite possible for those institutions which have academic calendars calling for classes opening on August 19, with their playing season opening September 25, to have five weeks of practice while classes are in session and two weeks additionally of practice before classes open, a total of seven weeks, and of course the multiple-practice session is available during the periods that the classes are in session.

I emphasize again what the committee considered to be the optimum format, a format calling for three weeks of practice, ideally two of double drills, one single drills.

The problem here relates to the fact that there are some institutions which cannot have two weeks of double drills. In conformity with the basic outline of that format, the committee has devised the proposition that the comparable number of practice opportunities be available as a minimum in any circumstance. Twenty-nine practice opportunities are available in any circumstance, regardless of the time of the opening of classes or of the opening of the season.

In effect, the equivalency is sought to be established between once daily practice, while the school is in session, and twice daily practice when the school is not in session. This may or may not be a valid equivalency. It was, however, in the opinion of the committee a reasonable equivalency and it is on that basis that the formula is submitted to you.

(The amendment to the amendment was defeated, viva voce.)

(The Amendment B, page 31 of the Convention Program, was passed, viva voce.)

## 11. REVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS

**President Plant:** This concludes our consideration of proposed amendments previously circulated. We will proceed now to the review of interpretations which appear on pages 35, 36 and 37 of your Program.

For the benefit of those who have any special interest in it, I direct your attention to Interpretation 118, on page 37. The Council asks that it be withdrawn, if there is no objection.

### Professionalism

**Arthur W. Nebel** (University of Missouri): Mr. President and delegates, the revision before you is O.I. 2-(d) pertaining to Constitution Article 3-1, dealing with professionalism. This pertains to subparagraph (3) and will read as follows:

"It is not permissible to pay:

"(3) Expenses incurred by a student-athlete in competing in an event which occurs at a time when the student-athlete is not regularly enrolled in a full-time program of studies or in attending an event which occurs at a time when he is not eligible to represent his institution." (Boldface indicates language to be added.)

Mr. President, I move the revision of O.I. 2-(d)-(3). (The motion was seconded and passed, 200-0.)

**M. R. Clausen** (University of Arizona): Mr. Chairman and Delegates: In an attempt to clarify the relationship between the student-athlete and professionalism, the following revision of O.I. 14 is proposed:

"A student-athlete may participate as an individual or as a member of a team against professional athletes, but he may not participate on a team known to him to be a professional team. For the purposes of this interpretation, a professional team shall be any team which is a member of or affiliated with a recognized professional sports organization, or any organized team which includes among its playing personnel any athlete who currently is under contract to a team which is a member of or affiliated with a professional organization in that sport, or any organized team on which there is an athlete receiving payment of any kind for his participation other than actual and necessary expenses for game trips. (EXCEPTION: An all-star team organized for and engaging in only one contest shall not be considered a professional team if one or more team members are under current contract to a professional sports organization; provided none of the team members receives compensation for the contest.)" (Boldface language to be added.)

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this revision. (The motion was seconded.)

This was written in the language of the NCAA Constitution and Bylaws Committee, and they feel the language is pretty much self-explanatory. The exception, you might be interested in knowing, comes up with something like the East-West game where some players are thought to be or known to be under contract professionally.

**David Swank** (University of Oklahoma): Do you intend, where it

says "organized team," to prohibit the "alumni scrimmage" that many of us have? This I think would have to be considered an organized team. There are at times people who are under professional contract who play on this type of team.

**Harry M. Cross** (University of Washington and chairman of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee): It certainly is not designed to reach that situation. My own interpretation would be that an organized team is not one assembled for the alumni affair.

**John A. Fuzak** (Michigan State University): What is happening at the present time in baseball is that a high school player signs a professional contract during the summer after his senior year. A little item may occur in the newspaper that he signed a professional contract. He perhaps has not received any compensation, this to be effective the following spring. He plays in a city league on a team which is strictly an amateur operation. As I understand it, any boy who would play on a team with him on the city league, since that has appeared in the paper, would be a professional. Is that correct?

**Mr. Clausen**: In speaking with the committee about this particular language, yes, it would be conceivable, but the committee felt the language, "team known to him or which reasonably should have been known to him to be a professional team," would be the only language to cover that situation.

**Mr. Fuzak**: Of course, this is just any individual athlete who plays on the team who is under contract. I suppose a little item appearing in the paper sometime or other, which probably most of the kids have not read, would be enough notice that he is a professional athlete. I guess that is what bothers me.

**Mr. Cross**: Mr. Fuzak, I think you have simplified my problem enormously by your last hypothetical. Unless you could fairly charge the youngster with knowing there were pros on the team he was playing with he would not be penalized. The happenstance that appeared in the local paper, with the general consensus that this is an amateur team would not make the team professional because there happened to be a boy who signed a contract.

**Jesse Hill** (University of Southern California): To me there is a very tenuous situation here. I see where it is possible for a boy to play on a local team and assume that no one on the team is being paid any money. If the manager should have to pay one player \$10 who is playing in that game, this boy would have known about it, and, under the terminology of this legislation, this would be a violation and he would have no way of really knowing of anyone receiving any money. He did not; someone else did.

**Mr. Cross**: You are correct, your hypothetical would characterize the team as a professional team, inadvertently perhaps, but it doesn't characterize the boy as a professional because he did not know it was a professional team. The definition of a professional team and the tagging of the youngster as a professional are two different things.

Under your hypothetical, your other boy could not reasonably have been said to know that was a professional team. Therefore, he would not by interpretation be characterized as a professional.

(The interpretation was approved, 135-31.)

## Eligibility Rules for NCAA Events

**Arthur Reynolds** (Colorado State College): Mr. President and Fellow Delegates: Amendment A on page 36 of your Program is an expansion of the O.I. 101 in regard to transfer students. This applies only to students in NCAA events. The proposal is to add the following material to the interpretation:

"He shall not be considered a transfer . . . (c) upon his return to his original institution after attendance of one semester or quarter at another collegiate institution for purposes of taking academic courses not available at his original institution."

I move that the proposed interpretation be adopted. (The motion was seconded.)

With so much emphasis now upon year-round education, many institutions are no longer offering a summer session as such. Rather, the old summer session has become a summer quarter or a summer trimester, or even a summer semester. This amendment permits the student to go to another campus to take work which would not be available on his own campus during the summer session. It does not definitely apply if he goes to the school for the summer session, for a summer semester or trimester. This amendment makes it possible for a student to attend another institution which offers a course which is not available on his own campus during the fall, winter or spring quarters or the first or second semester, as the case may be.

**Paul W. Brechler** (Western Athletic Conference): If a student takes a course not available, and four courses that are available, what is he?

**Mr. Reynolds**: By the wording of the amendment, Paul, he would not be considered as a transfer student.

(The amendment was approved, viva voce.)

**J. William Davis** (Texas Technological College): Mr. President, Amendment B is a revision of O.I. 113. The following sentence has been added:

"If a high school graduate attends a college preparatory school for a full academic year, he may be judged by his predicted grade point average as a high school graduate or on the basis of his college preparatory record."

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this amendment. (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Mr. President, Amendment C is another interpretation which I think is completely noncontroversial.

The object of this new O.I. is finally to give a definition to the term "student-athlete" which is used in a number of places in the Constitution and Bylaws, and I think this is a satisfactory working definition of the term "student-athlete."

Mr. President, I move the adoption of O.I. 115. (The motion was seconded.)

**Hugh G. McCurdy** (Wesleyan University): I would like to have a definition of the word "solicited."

**Mr. Davis**: Mr. McCurdy, I am afraid in these circumstances I cannot define it to your satisfaction. I would say the idea of recruitment in some way or other is involved in this. I don't know that we can define this. In common parlance I think it should be understood.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Our President has told our men in the athletic department that they cannot visit any school or any college for any purpose except speaking at a banquet or some function, at which time they may talk with the boys.

Boys do visit our campus regularly, and some of them are interested in athletics and some of them talk to some of the coaches.

Are we in a position to get a clear answer for this kind of case? Are we soliciting them?

**Mr. Davis:** I would think so. This includes not only the solicitation by a member of the staff but also by representatives of the athletic interests.

(The interpretation was approved, viva voce.)

**Earl Ramer** (University of Tennessee): Mr. President and Delegates: Amendment D to add O.I. 116 is a further interpretation of Bylaw Article 4-6-(b). The proposed language is as follows:

"It is not permissible for a member institution to retest a student upon his enrollment at the institution and use that test score in determining his predictability if prior to his enrollment the student had been tested and his prediction established."

This is perfectly clear I think and consistent with the original intent of our legislation.

Mr. President, I move its approval.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

The proposed addition of Official Interpretation 117, reads as follows:

"If a student's predictability has not been established and he reports for practice or competition, the institution shall be required to establish his prediction within four weeks from the time the student reports. During the four-week period, the student may engage in practice but not competition. At the end of the four-week period, if the student's prediction has not been determined, he must terminate his practice until the prediction is known. If the student eventually predicts 1.600 or better, he is eligible to practice and represent the institution in competition in accordance with institutional policies."

Gentlemen, our 1.600 legislation precludes both participation in practice and competition for students not predicting 1.600. This interpretation recognizes the need for a little flexibility, for the occasional student who does not complete the test at the time of his admission or shortly thereafter.

It also recognizes the need for time to make the official record on eligibility to compete in conference or the NCAA. There is a four-week period in which the grade point average can be established. In the meantime the student can practice, but not compete.

Mr. President, I move the approval of this interpretation. (The motion was seconded.)

**Lysle Butler** (Oberlin College): We have students for whom no predictability is possible, because we have no class rank when they enter the institution. It is not possible at the end of four weeks or any other time to get these class ranks. Therefore, I think this O.I. is going to be hard to live with. Either you are not going to pay any attention to those institutions that have this difficulty, or you

are going to restrict our participation in NCAA competition.

Let me point out in that last respect that all these O.I's, from 113 to and including 118, apply not to your regular competition, participation on the squad or competition in regular games, but only if you want to be eligible for NCAA competition. I think many people are confused by these O.I's. They are stated so definitely as to appear to apply to all your competition, and such is not the case. This comes in a section of eligibility for NCAA competition.

We have foreign students and other students from some of the preparatory schools in the East, on which we have no class rank and no possibility of ever determining predictability on the national table.

**Mr. Ramer:** Mr. Butler, under our interpretation, we felt all our students must comply, and if the 1.600 has not been established as a predicted grade point average then this student may not participate in practice or in competition.

Furthermore, an institution must be in compliance fully with this provision for a period of two years in order to be eligible for participation in NCAA events.

**Mr. Butler** and **Mr. President**, we would be able to live with this proposed interpretation much better than with the present one.

**Mr. Butler:** That is true, but you still haven't given me any answer as to what we are going to do with approximately 10 to 25 students we normally have for whom we have no predictability. You can soften it or do anything you want to, but you still are not able to get predictability. There is no question in our minds the boys have a 1.600 predictability, or they wouldn't be there. However, to satisfy this on paper is an impossibility.

**Mr. Ramer:** Mr. Butler, this particular point was discussed in the Council, and we felt a four-week period for the establishment of predictability was a period of reasonable length. I fail to understand at this point why it would not be sufficient time.

**Mr. Butler:** I am going to vote against approval of the O.I. because I think it is very difficult for a number of institutions, including ours. Time has nothing to do with it. It is the impossibility of getting predictability factors recommended by the prediction table. We are never able to get them. We have some students recommended to us by the State Department for whom we have no scores or their scores cannot be obtained, but as far as class rank is concerned they are never going to be available to us for certain students.

**President Plant:** There have been cases of foreign students who, because of language deficiencies, were not able to take the test. Under those circumstances it is policy to accept the registrar's judgment as to the student's capacity.

**Mr. Butler:** Would you state, sir, for the record, that such flexibility now exists for those students for which we have no class rank and if, in the judgment of our registrar, there is no question about the predictability factor of these students they may participate not only during the first four weeks but for the balance of the season?

**President Plant:** My understanding is we do not accept the registrar's certification in that kind of case.

There is no degree of flexibility there.

(The interpretation was approved, viva voce.)

As I mentioned, it is the disposition of the Council to withdraw O.I. 118, relating to financial aid during the summer session, and unless there is objection from the floor it will be withdrawn. Hearing none, it will be treated as withdrawn.

**Robert F. Ray** (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry. The proposal having been withdrawn, I would like to ask if it has been circulated to the membership up to the time of this convention.

**President Plant:** O.I. 118 was adopted at the May, 1967, meeting of the Council. It was circulated to the membership and immediately there were protests from certain sources indicating that commitments had already been made to students for the summer of 1967.

The officers took cognizance and later the Council approved the action, on the fact that the circulation did not come until a late date in the year, until the summer session was impending, and for that reason suspended its application, and it has been in suspension since.

So the answer is: No, it has not been in effect during 1967 at all.

**Mr. Ray:** I take it, it will perhaps become a matter for further Council action.

I would like to call the Council's attention to O.I. 2 of the Constitution, to the effect that "Financial aid may be awarded to any student-athlete for any term or session (including summer session) . . ."

Traditionally we have considered summer sessions to be attached to the end of the academic year as opposed to the beginning. In further consideration that factor should be taken into account or we will have a situation in which the O.I. can be confusing.

**President Plant:** That question has been debated to some extent in the Council and some who are present may recall two or three years ago the Parliamentarian ruled in connection with the suggestion you have made. The Parliamentarian later concluded he was in error on that. However, without going into that aspect, I draw your attention to O.I. 114, in which there are two indications the Council believes your last statement to be in accordance with its philosophy, that is, that the summer session is attached to the preceding two semesters.

I make that reference to indicate that your statements concerning the applicability of O.I. 2 did not meet with the agreement of the Chair, so they will not rise to haunt him in the future, as some statements in the past have done.

#### **Limitations on Out-of-Season Practice**

**Ernest McCoy** (Pennsylvania State University): Mr. President and Fellow Delegates: The suggested amendment to O.I. 182 limits the exception granted to postseason practices for established events and prohibits participation in these sessions by students who are not eligible for that event.

I move its adoption. (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

#### **Eligibility Rules for NCAA Events**

**Arthur Reynolds** (Colorado State College): Mr. President and Fellow Delegates: O.I. 109 is a special interpretation to clarify that part of our eligibility rules for NCAA events that deals with the transfer of students from the junior college, who are at the junior college for just a single year and are transferring with a minimum grade standard. The proposed O.I. is:

"In the administration of the twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit prescribed by Bylaw 4-1-(d), all grades earned by a student in courses which would be transferable to the certifying institution must be included in determining whether the student has earned a 'B' average. All grades earned in courses which are not transferable to the certifying institution irrespective of the grade earned shall not be included in determining whether the student has earned a 'B' average."

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this Official Interpretation. (The motion was seconded.)

**Paul W. Brechler** (Western Athletic Conference): I would like to ask one question. You talk about some institutions that will not accept an "E" or "F" of any course. Is that a nontransferable?

**Mr. Reynolds:** No. The course would be transferable if the grade earned had been high enough to satisfy. In that case the grade which was earned must be added to determine whether the student does have a "B" average.

(The interpretation was approved, viva voce.)

#### **12. REVISIONS IN EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS**

**President Plant:** We will turn now to the Revisions of Executive Regulations, starting on page 39 of the Convention Program. Unless there is objection or specific inquiry, I would like to ask for unanimous approval of these. If, however, there is a question on any point, every delegate should feel free to raise it and everyone has the right to object to unanimous approval.

Hearing no objection, the Chair will deem there is unanimous approval of the Revisions in Executive Regulations.

#### **13. RESOLUTION**

**President Plant:** I have consulted with members of the Council and we have given consideration to a resolution. It indicates the policy of reactivating NCAA Bylaw 7-B at an appropriate date. I would like to ask you to consider it and, if you feel so inclined, to approve this policy.

#### **NCAA Council Statement**

"The day before the Senate Commerce Committee hearings began in August, 1965, the NCAA advised the Chairman of the Commerce Committee that it would voluntarily refrain from enforcing NCAA Bylaw 7-B, pending the outcome of the hearings. The hearings led to a moratorium, and the NCAA agreed to continue to refrain from enforcing its rule during the moratorium.

"The Senate adopted a resolution calling upon the Vice-President to appoint an Arbitration Board. The Board first met in December, 1965. The NCAA has voluntarily continued, even against its better judgment, to refrain from enforcing Bylaw 7-B during the lengthy

time the Arbitration Board has deliberated on the disputes.

"The Council has now decided it will resume enforcement of Bylaw 7-B, starting the first of November, 1968, and in doing this the NCAA is simply reaffirming the colleges' traditional position that through their collective agency they must satisfy themselves of the conditions of competition not conducted by a collegiate organization in which the student-athlete competes. The member institutions of the NCAA have this responsibility for the welfare of students in sports in which an outside organization exerts marked influence, and they cannot escape it.

"At no time in the course of the dispute was the NCAA obliged to refrain from enforcing the rule. The rule is not a restraint upon competition. It does not prohibit the student from participating in any competition consistent with his educational program. In fact, it is a reasonable rule and a rule which is necessary for the internal operation of the NCAA and the membership. The ruling is not comparable to AAU Rule 125, which is a boycott, which prevents any meet operators from sanctioning or accepting the sanction of any other than the AAU. The AAU rule in our opinion is illegal because it constitutes a boycott, and because boycotts are per se a violation of the law of the United States."

This is a policy the NCAA is proposing to announce. If any delegate will so move, we will accept it as approval. (The motion was regularly made and seconded that the policy be approved.)

**Max O. Schultze** (University of Minnesota): Just for clarification, will this prohibit one of our students from participating as an unattached individual in an AAU meet?

**President Plant:** No. It is my understanding it will not apply to unattached competition.

**Jesse T. Hill** (University of Southern California): Mr. President, I differ from that because I believe that any institution could then enter all of its athletes on that basis, and you would be destroying the purpose of this legislation.

**President Plant:** I guess I am wrong. "No member institution shall be represented or permit its student-athletes to compete in any track and field meet which is not sponsored, promoted, managed and controlled by the collegiate entity unless such meet complies with the following requirements:"

The Chair is in error, and the answer to Professor Schultze is the opposite to the one I gave; that this would affect an unattached athlete.

(The resolution was adopted, viva voce.)

#### 14. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

**Richard C. Larkins** (Ohio State University): Mr. President and Delegates: I would call your attention to page 8 of the Convention Program, listing the members of the Committee on Committees. I would like to express my personal appreciation to each of those men for the work they have done.

Your attention is also directed to page 77 of the Convention Program which lists the various Rules and Meet or Tournament Committees under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Committees.

Before I mention the nominees, I would like, on behalf of the Association, to express appreciation to those men whose terms have

expired and who have done such excellent work in the various sports.

(The committees for 1968, as nominated by the Committee on Committees and elected by the Convention, are set forth on pages 82-89 of the 1968 NCAA Manual.)

#### 15. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

**Bradford A. Booth** (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. President, I have the honor to present the selections of the Nominating Committee for the positions of President; Secretary-Treasurer; Vice-Presidents for Districts One, Three, Five and Seven; Vice-President-at-Large; and three members of the Council-at-large.

I would be remiss, however, if before I did so I failed to acknowledge the work of my colleagues on the Nominating Committee who last night worked diligently and in full harmony to present the slate.

Since there are some changes from the list as printed in your Convention Program may I read their names?

Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Frank Carver, University of Pittsburgh

Walter C. Bryant, University of the South

James R. McCoy, Ohio State University

William Baughn, University of Colorado

J. William Davis, Texas Technological College

James R. Jack, University of Utah

Willis J. Stetson, Swarthmore College

Lysle Butler, Oberlin College

Rixford J. Snyder, Stanford University

Bradford A. Booth, UCLA, Chairman.

(The Officers and Members of the Council, as selected by the Nominating Committee and elected by the Convention are set forth on pages 5-6 of these Proceedings.)

**President Plant:** Let me, on behalf of Council, express the deep appreciation of Council to the Convention committees, if it is seemly for me to do so to the Nominating Committee. I know the Committee on Committees and the Nominating Committee have worked very hard.

I was deeply moved last year when you elected me to this office, and I am deeply moved now. It is a pleasure to serve you, although really I do not serve you; I work with you. I shall continue to do the best I can, and I hope that you will continue to bear with me.

I again thank you for the honor you have done me.

**Edward M. Bennett** (Washington State University): I would ask for clarification of one of the pieces of legislation.

One thing that is not clear to me and several other people I have talked to about the freshman rule is that in the wording there is no mention of whether this rule is retroactive. It says he has four years of varsity competition. What happens if a senior says, "Now, I want my fourth year."

**Milton F. Hartvigsen** (Brigham Young University): It is my impression that the legislation would not be retroactive. That was the intention of the committee.

**President Plant:** It would not affect those who have achieved the status of sophomore, senior or junior prior to this enactment.

(The convention then adjourned at 3:50 p.m.)

## APPENDIX A

### Report of the Treasurer

The accounts of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, set forth on the following pages, were audited by the Francis A. Wright Company, a firm of accountants and auditors located in Kansas City, Missouri. The Company's report, signed by Ralph E. Bostwick, CPA, included the following exhibits and schedules which "fairly reflect the financial position of the National Collegiate Athletic Association on August 31, 1967, and the income and expense of that organization for the fiscal year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted principles of accounting applied on a basis consistent with that of preceding years."—Ernest B. McCoy, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer.

#### ASSETS

	Year Ended August 31	
	1967	1966
<b>Current Assets:</b>		
Cash on hand and in banks .....	\$478,310.59	\$214,532.57
Accounts receivable—trade .....	46,339.89	39,342.16
Interest receivable .....	530.00	
Inventories .....	19,936.90	22,547.13
Television program expense paid in advance .....	21,666.73	18,412.49
Prepaid expense .....	6,667.15	6,720.18
<b>Total Current Assets .....</b>	<b>573,451.26</b>	<b>301,554.53</b>
<b>Deferred Charges:</b>		
Advanced against future commitments ....	3,500.00	6,000.00
<b>Investments:</b>		
Advisory Investment Trust—1 (Schedule 1) .....	\$333,384.69	\$335,838.87
Funded Cash (Schedule 2) .....	192,237.43 *	226,060.52
Other investments .....		188,788.02
Advisory Trust—City National Bank .....	53,000.00	
Scholarship Foundation Trust— Commerce Trust Company .....	1,000.00	
<b>Total Investments .....</b>	<b>579,622.12</b>	<b>750,687.41</b>

	Cost	Accumulated Depreciation	Cost Less Depreciation
<b>Fixed Assets:</b>			
Furniture and fixtures ..	\$58,039.76	\$31,449.24	\$26,590.52

\*The difference between this amount and the related funded cash reserve, is represented by uninvested funds included in the general cash balance.

Leasehold improve-ments ...	4,380.04	619.82	3,760.22
	\$62,419.80	\$32,069.06	\$30,350.74

Cost of Fixed Assets less Accumulated Depreciation .....	30,350.74	25,461.32
<b>Other Assets:</b>		
Unamortized advance—CAPS .....	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 5,000.00
Travel deposits .....	425.00	425.00
<b>Total Other Assets .....</b>	<b>2,925.00</b>	<b>5,425.00</b>
<b>Total Assets .....</b>	<b>\$1,189,849.12</b>	<b>\$1,089,128.26</b>

#### LIABILITIES, RESERVES AND SURPLUS

	Year Ended August 31	
	1967	1966
<b>Current Liabilities:</b>		
Accounts payable .....	\$ 174.24	\$ 243.65
Olympic contributions .....	1,055.00	17,916.50
Due participating colleges for meets and tournaments .....	3,481.93	
Payroll taxes withheld .....	4,128.72	3,432.84
<b>Total Current Liabilities .....</b>	<b>8,839.89</b>	<b>21,592.99</b>
<b>Deferred Income:</b>		
Publications .....	3,546.68	5,718.44
Dues .....	725.00	87.50
<b>Total Deferred Income .....</b>	<b>4,271.68</b>	<b>5,805.94</b>
<b>Reserves:</b>		
Advisory Investment Trust—1 (Schedule 1) .....	333,384.69	335,838.87
Advisory Investment Trust—A .....	67,261.20	
Funded Cash .....	193,498.65 *	245,343.48
<b>Championship Events:</b>		
Baseball .....	\$ 14,221.11	14,366.02
College Division Football ..	64,364.47	55,135.71
College World Series		
Contract .....	10,000.00	10,000.00
Gymnastics .....	3,425.91	3,425.91
Ice Hockey .....	16,512.68	16,512.68
Indoor Track and Field ....	15,920.86	15,920.86
Outdoor Track and Field ..	5,074.08	5,074.08
Swimming .....	4,601.57	4,601.57
Wrestling .....	6,843.84	6,843.84
Other NCAA Events .....	20,000.00	160,964.52

\*The difference between this amount and the related funded cash reserve, is represented by uninvested funds included in the general cash balance.

# Miscellaneous:

Academic Testing and Requirements .....	\$ 2,520.75	4,569.00
Advancement of Intercollegiate Football ..	104,660.66	44,422.31
Awards .....	1,587.18	2,025.15
College Division .....	40,123.40	51,754.79
Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports	18,163.93	9,886.74
Legal .....	23,263.58	16,445.00
Media Seminar .....	5,641.52	5,000.00
Postgraduate Scholarships..	44,862.05	31,396.82
Promotion of Indoor Track..	5,000.00	
Special Committee .....	14,443.24	9,489.30
Special Track Committee ..	10,000.00	
USCSC Membership .....	15,000.00	285,266.31
Model Management Manual .....		717.69
NCAB Moving .....		7,000.00
NCAB Pension .....		7,700.00
Total Reserves .....	1,040,375.37	903,470.72
Surplus (Schedule 3) .....	136,362.18	158,258.61
Total Liabilities, Reserves and Surplus .....	\$ 1,189,849.12	\$1,089,128.26

## ADVISORY INVESTMENT TRUST ACCOUNT—1

August 31, 1967

(Schedule 1)

### United States Government Securities (at cost):

U.S. Treasury	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value	Market Value	Cost
bonds .....	2-15-95	3%	\$100,000.00	\$ 80,187.50	\$100,531.25
bonds .....	6-15-83	3¼%	26,000.00	20,878.00	26,000.00
bonds .....	2-15-80	4%	5,000.00)		4,950.00
bonds .....	2-15-80	4¼%	4,000.00)	7,930.80	3,940.00
bonds .....	5-15-85	4¼%	10,000.00)		10,000.00
bonds .....	5-15-85/75	4¼%	10,000.00)	18,080.00	10,037.50
			\$155,000.00	\$127,076.30	\$155,458.75

### Corporation Stocks (at cost):

	Number of Shares	Class		
American Telephone and Telegraph .....	200	Capital	10,150.00	9,247.63
E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. ..	45	Common	7,087.50	5,891.66
General Electric Co. ....	100	Common	10,925.00	8,852.88
General Motors Co. ....	33	Common	2,755.50	2,464.88
B. F. Goodrich Co. ....	50	Common	3,137.50	3,974.19

# Houston Lighting and

Power Co. ....	100	Common	4,212.50	5,194.15
Illinois Power Co. ....	100	Common	3,875.00	3,838.00
Indianapolis Power and Light Co. ....	100	Common	3,137.50	3,486.25
International Business Machines .....	32	Common	15,992.00	9,763.22
John Mansfield Corp. ....	50	Common	3,056.25	3,006.88
Monsanto Chemical Co. ....	116	Common	5,089.50	4,757.80
Northern States Power Co. ....	200	Common	6,125.00	4,811.50
Phillips Petroleum Co. ....	100	Common	6,362.50	5,582.04
Pitney Bowes, Inc. ....	100	Common	7,075.00	4,315.38
G. O. Searle and Company ..	100	Common	5,850.00	3,574.19
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana .....	200	Common	11,700.00	4,868.13
Texaco, Inc. ....	109	Capital	7,970.63	4,291.28
			114,501.38	87,920.06

## Corporation Bonds (at cost):

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value		
John Deere and Co. ....	10-31-86	4½%	\$10,000.00	8,337.50	9,925.00
Illinois Central Equipment Co. ....	2- 1-72	4½%	5,000.00	4,525.00	4,874.07
Louisville & Nashville Railroad ..	1- 1-69	4½%	5,000.00	4,868.75	4,941.73
Equip. Trust ...	6-15-78	5¼%	15,000.00	13,725.00	14,738.40
Seaboard Airline Railroad .....	8- 1-68	4¼%	10,000.00	9,837.50	10,057.44
Equip. Trust ...	3- 1-75	5½%	10,000.00	9,462.50	9,947.70
Southern Pacific Equip. Trust ...	11- 1-73	4½%	10,000.00	9,287.50	10,340.00
			\$65,000.00	60,043.75	64,824.34

## Other Securities (at cost):

Farmers Home Administration notes .....	6-23-91	5.40%	\$24,879.58	24,879.58	24,879.58
Other:					
Principal Balance—Cash .....				301.96	301.96

## Total Advisory Investment

Trust Account—1 .....	\$326,802.97	\$333,384.69
-----------------------	--------------	--------------

## FUNDED CASH RESERVE

August 31, 1967

(Schedule 2)

## Savings Accounts:

	Cost
City National Bank and Trust Company .....	\$10,000.00
Commerce Trust Company .....	10,514.31

California Savings and Loan Association .....	10,000.00
Lincoln Savings Association .....	10,452.81
Security Savings and Loan Association .....	10,000.00
Swedish American Savings and Loan Association.....	10,000.00

Total Savings Accounts ..... 60,967.12

United States Government Securities:

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value	Market Value	
U.S. Treas. notes	8-15-68	3¾%	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 24,687.50	\$ 24,789.06
U.S. Treas. notes	5-15-71	5¼%	23,000.00	22,913.75	23,000.00
U.S. Treas. notes	2-15-68	5½%	20,000.00	20,062.50	20,000.00
U.S. Treas. notes	11-15-70	5 %	20,000.00	19,793.75	19,718.75
U.S. Treas. bonds	10- 1-69	4 %	19,000.00	18,525.00	18,762.50
Federal Land Banks					
Consolidated Federal					
Farm Loan					
Bonds .....	2-20-70	5½%	25,000.00	24,750.00	25,000.00
			<u>\$132,000.00</u>	<u>\$130,732.50</u>	<u>\$131,270.31</u>

Total Funded Cash Reserve.....\$192,237.43

**ANALYSIS OF SURPLUS**  
(Schedule 3)

Balance September 1, 1966 .....	\$158,258.61
Additions:	
General Income (Schedule 3-A).....	\$526,010.46
Less: General Expense (Schedule 3-B)...	385,286.55
	<u>140,723.91</u>
Television Balance (Schedule 3-C).....	735.31
	<u>141,459.22</u>
National Collegiate Athletic Bureau	
Net Loss (Schedule 3-D).....(	7,681.43)
College Athletics Publishing Service	
Net Income (Schedule 3-D) .....	<u>11,324.02</u>
Total Net Income for fiscal year	
ended August 31, 1967.....	145,101.81
Increase in equity of CAPS.....	5,847.47
Reclassification of fixed assets .....	4,097.33
Increase in surplus NCAB and CAPS.....	<u>32,145.20</u>
Total Additions to Surplus.....	187,191.81
	<u>345,450.42</u>
Deductions:	
Transfers to Special Reserves:	
USCSC Membership .....	\$ 15,000.00
Special Committee .....	8,000.00

Other NCAA Events .....	20,000.00
Media Seminar .....	5,000.00
Promotion of Indoor Track..	5,000.00
Special Track Committee....	10,000.00
Competitive Safeguards and	
Medical Aspects of Sports	10,000.00
Advisory Investment	
Trust-A .....	67,261.20
Funded Cash Reserve.....	1,155.17
Special Reserve .....	11,844.59
Legal .....	40,000.00
	<u>193,260.96</u>

Payments for appreciation awards.....	327.28
Grants to affiliated members.....	<u>15,500.00</u>

Total Deductions from Surplus..... 209,088.24

Balance .....\$136,362.18

**GENERAL INCOME**  
(Schedule 3-A)

	Year Ended August 31	
	1967	1966
Membership Dues .....	\$ 63,887.50	\$ 61,250.00
Meets and Tournaments:		
Basketball .....	330,112.63	261,020.49
Baseball .....	11,833.89	6,199.44
Indoor Track .....	14,749.81	4,209.15
Wrestling .....	10,070.41	2,315.56
Swimming .....	6,882.50	2,282.53
Gymnastics .....		2,057.45
Track and Field .....		1,304.72
Ice Hockey .....	15,314.47	595.09
	<u>388,963.71</u>	<u>279,984.43</u>
Royalties and Other:		
Administration fee—		
television assessments .....	34,000.00	34,000.00
Spencer Advertising Company .....	5,000.00	5,000.00
Registration fees .....	1,975.00	1,980.00
Football program feature service .....	348.60	272.75
Sundry .....	1,944.67	733.21
	<u>43,268.27</u>	<u>41,985.96</u>
Investment Income .....	29,890.98	25,168.25
Total General Income .....	<u>\$526,010.46</u>	<u>\$408,388.64</u>

# GENERAL EXPENSE

(Schedule 3-B)

	Year Ended August 31	
	1967	1966
Rules Committee Meetings:		
Football .....	\$ 4,541.31	\$ 7,581.45
Basketball .....	2,892.80	4,774.37
Swimming .....	3,071.44	3,976.00
Wrestling .....	3,660.95	2,542.87
Track and Field .....	2,981.08	2,445.37
Baseball .....	2,238.31	1,570.65
Gymnastics .....	1,809.49	1,320.50
Ice Hockey .....	1,087.42	1,164.90
Skiing .....	1,325.18	1,158.32
Soccer .....	2,053.59	1,004.58
Fencing .....	1,042.59	577.13
Lacrosse .....	413.84	400.60
	<u>27,118.00</u>	<u>28,516.74</u>
Other Committee Meetings:		
Council .....	8,962.66	10,754.63
Infractions .....	10,935.51	6,612.31
Executive .....	4,562.41	6,333.26
Special .....	7,388.24	5,929.02
Public Relations .....	2,191.02	2,369.63
College .....	3,616.17	2,199.24
Extra Events .....	572.62	1,581.68
	<u>38,228.63</u>	<u>35,779.77</u>
Meets and Tournaments:		
Insurance .....	6,143.00	6,104.00
Indoor Track .....	642.81	762.34
Gymnastics .....		756.47
	<u>6,785.81</u>	<u>7,622.81</u>
Miscellaneous:		
Annual Convention .....	12,258.70	15,161.18
Complimentary membership guides .....		1,297.43
	<u>12,258.70</u>	<u>16,458.61</u>
Secretary's Expense Rules Committee .....	4,617.05	
Grants:		
National Collegiate Athletic Bureau .....	51,000.00	51,500.00
National Association of Basketball Coaches .....	3,000.00	3,000.00
Track and Field Statistics .....	1,701.63	1,200.00
Miscellaneous .....	150.00	150.00
	<u>55,851.63</u>	<u>55,850.00</u>

# General Administrative:

Salaries .....	139,079.35	124,398.97
Printing and duplicating .....	25,146.68	17,615.01
Rent .....	15,471.76	14,499.96
Annuity and insurance .....	15,604.89	12,440.66
Telephone and telegraph .....	8,556.04	8,284.82
Postage and express .....	7,873.49	8,021.59
Office supplies and expense .....	6,776.58	6,958.63
Director and staff expense .....	6,380.98	5,579.73
Payroll taxes .....	3,910.60	2,972.55
Depreciation .....	3,025.63	2,918.98
Membership dues .....	2,469.00	2,465.00
Contingency .....	1,547.32	2,005.11
Legal .....	1,525.00	1,200.00
Office equipment repairs .....	1,150.67	947.23
Subscriptions .....	453.25	404.50
President, secretary and treasurer's expense .....		70.89
Miscellaneous .....	1,455.49	1,226.88
	<u>240,426.73</u>	<u>212,010.51</u>
Total General Expense .....	<u>\$385,286.55</u>	<u>\$356,238.44</u>

# TELEVISION INCOME AND EXPENSE

(Schedule 3-C)

	Year Ended August 31	
	1967	1966
Income:		
Assessments .....	\$310,000.00	\$260,880.00
Expense:		
Salary—program director .....	6,999.72	6,499.92
Publicity and public relations .....	20,569.83	20,495.91
Committee meeting expense .....	6,896.70	16,926.93
NCAA operating expense and assessments .....	15,000.00	15,000.00
Attendance statistics and analysis .....	10,000.00	10,000.00
Legal fees .....	8,000.00	
Grant to Football Rules Committee .....	4,000.00	4,000.00
Telephone and telegraph .....	4,219.25	3,156.34
Miscellaneous .....	2,500.00	
Printing and duplicating .....	2,252.95	2,448.26
Program director's secretarial assistance .....	945.33	1,194.00
Special travel and entertainment .....	2,953.30	888.49
Postage .....	827.72	271.60
Program director's office expense .....	99.89	96.13
	<u>85,264.69</u>	<u>80,977.58</u>
Total Expense .....		
Excess of Assessments over Expense .....	<u>224,735.31</u>	<u>179,902.42</u>

Less: Transfers to Reserve Funds—		
Special Reserve .....	85,000.00	80,000.00
Postgraduate Scholarships Reserve.....	75,000.00	55,000.00
Advancement of Intercollegiate Football Reserve .....	64,000.00	44,880.00
Total Transfers .....	224,000.00	179,880.00
Net Balance .....	\$ 735.31	\$ 22.42

**NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC BUREAU AND  
COLLEGE ATHLETICS PUBLISHING SERVICE  
STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSE  
(Schedule 3-D)**

	Total	National Collegiate Athletic Bureau	College Athletics Publishing Service
Book sales .....	\$141,700.28		\$141,700.28
Advertising revenue .....	10,589.55		10,589.55
News stand and special edition sales.....	8,984.53		8,984.53
Miscellaneous income .....	247.00		247.00
Grant from NCAA Operating Budget .....	51,000.00	\$ 51,000.00	
Grant from NCAA television..	10,000.00	10,000.00	
Schedules and publishers service .....	3,304.70	3,304.70	
Statistical service .....	4,256.49	4,256.49	
Printed forms .....	3,370.22	3,370.22	
Statistical subscriptions.....	4,195.80	4,195.80	
Basketball score service.....	10,168.39	10,168.39	
Fee from CAPS .....	10,000.00	10,000.00	
Add: Back transfer of income NCAA .....	4,500.00		4,500.00
Gross Income .....	262,316.96	96,295.60	166,021.36
Expense:			
Guide manufacturing .....	48,519.43		48,519.43
Guide editing .....	2,501.24		2,501.24
Guide transportation .....	9,776.64		9,776.64
Guide transportation .....	5,138.91		5,138.91
Guide miscellaneous .....	116.22		116.22
Fee to NCAB .....	10,000.00		10,000.00
Salaries .....	103,226.07	53,480.34	49,745.73
Rent .....	9,650.33	5,566.55	4,083.78
Utilities .....	538.70	392.75	145.95
Telephone and telegraph.....	6,943.65	5,301.09	1,642.56
Office supplies .....	2,291.18	1,310.16	981.02
Office equipment repairs .....	678.76	296.65	382.11
Postage and mailing.....	12,167.88	9,342.75	2,825.13

Printing and duplicating .....	14,563.96	12,223.46	2,340.50
IBM tabulating .....	6,311.54	6,311.54	
Travel .....	1,058.73	707.33	351.40
Meetings and entertainment..	1,020.80	371.92	648.88
Professional services .....	800.00	400.00	400.00
Insurance .....	9,600.00	4,646.93	4,953.07
Payroll taxes .....	2,847.78	1,558.60	1,289.18
Contingency .....	618.36	303.74	314.62
Miscellaneous .....	423.52	301.00	122.52
Amortization of leasehold improvements .....	139.10		139.10
Depreciation .....	1,541.57	1,462.22	79.35
Promotion .....	600.00		600.00
Auto allowance .....	600.00		600.00
Fee to NCAA .....	4,500.00		4,500.00
Amortization of publication loan .....	2,500.00		2,500.00
Total Expenses .....	258,674.37	103,977.03	154,697.34
Net Income or (Loss)....	\$ 3,642.59	(\$ 7,681.43)	\$ 11,324.02

## APPENDIX B

### *Before the Sports Arbitration Board Brief on Final Argument of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*

The hearings have established that there are two areas of the track and field disputes, the first arising out of the illegal boycott and reprisal actions of the AAU, which must be terminated if the disputes are ever to end, and the second relating to the need for improved procedures for selection of coaches and competitors and the handling of arrangements pertaining to international competition.

#### AAU "Authority" and The Illegal Boycott

##### I.

The evidence in the case establishes the following points which are basic to any solution to the disputes:

(a) The AAU is a voluntary association having jurisdiction over only those individuals who voluntarily join it and deriving its authority from such international federations—the IAAF in the case of track and field—as designate the AAU as their representative in the U. S. As Mr. Kheel (chairman of the Sports Arbitration Board) has noted, the only thing the IAAF can properly ask an organization in the U. S. to do is to qualify athletes for international competition (Tr. November 9, 1967, page 122) Since the reach of the international body is limited to *international* competition, that body cannot control or designate any other organization to control *domestic* competition in the United States.

(b) The responsibility of a domestic organization such as the AAU to qualify athletes for international competition neither justifies nor requires it approving all of the hundreds of thousands of track and field meets conducted in the United States each year and the AAU has never done so. In fact, the task would be physically impossible, especially since the AAU is so remote from the school and college organizations which conduct the overwhelming preponderance of the competitions in the United States. The attempt of the AAU to pretend that it is approving, either itself or by delegation, all of the competitions in the United States each year is pure sophistry and would be laughable were it not coupled with its illegal sole sanctioning rule and the illegal boycott and reprisal actions in which the AAU engages sporadically against selected athletes in the hope of enforcing domestic monopoly control with the threat of ineligibility for international competition. The AAU has applied the term "closed" to NCAA meets, high school meets, Junior College meets, YMCA meets, etc. because the AAU cannot in fact succeed in its assertion of jurisdiction over them. If it would characterize USTFF meets as "closed" it would solve its own problem and end most of the track disputes in the U. S. today. By its

own admission, the AAU refuses to take this step because it fears the USTFF! And this fear produces the illegal practices which create the problems. The only solution to the AAU's insecurity is for the AAU to develop a strong program and compete fairly with the USTFF. It can no longer hide behind the feeble excuse of "international rules" to justify illegal practices at home.

(c) At the present time, and for years past, the USTFF and its institutional constituents have borne the sole responsibility for determining the amateur standing of competitors in all high school competitions, virtually all major college and university competitions, virtually all junior college competitions and all mixed competitions among different levels of school and college competitors. The AAU has nothing to do with the certification of amateurism of the overwhelming majority of these competitors at any time during their athletic careers.

(d) The AAU contention that it has sole jurisdiction over non-students in domestic competition is equally devoid of support; the AAU can properly assert jurisdiction in domestic competition over only those individuals who voluntarily submit to it, whether students or non-students. The use of the term "open" to refer to non-students does not give the AAU the jurisdiction it asserts over all non-students. An athlete can join a USTFF track club and not the AAU if he chooses. He must join the AAU *only* when he has qualified for international competition for which the AAU is the U. S. certification agency of the international sponsor.

(e) The USTFF is the sanctioning agent for competitions among its institutional members. In this capacity, the USTFF sanctions a far greater number of meets and certifies the amateurism of a vastly greater number of competitors in a given year than does the AAU. In addition, it is far more competent than the AAU to perform these functions with respect to competitors who belong to it or its member organizations and to sanction meets in which they participate. In the interest of expanding competitive opportunity for the American athlete, the USTFF should be encouraged to promote more competition for its members without interference from the AAU. No IAAF rule can or does give the AAU authority to sanction USTFF meets. No IAAF rule requires or justifies AAU punitive action against non-AAU athletes for simply participating in USTFF competition. Such punitive actions accomplish no purpose relevant to international rules or to the promotion of amateurism. As elaborated in III, below, it is clear that AAU Rule 1-2-(b) and actions thereunder have no basis in IAAF rules and are illegal under U. S. antitrust laws.

(f) An individual athlete in the United States is an amateur on his own say-so until proven otherwise. This applies both to ordinary domestic competition and to domestic qualifying meets for international competition. There is no need for the AAU to be told that each competitor is an amateur on each occasion he competes and this has never been done. For AAU meets or international qualification meets the AAU has accepted the certification of the other organizations, such as the NCAA, to which the athlete belongs. It can and should do the same thing with the USTFF as to its members when they enter competitions with which the AAU properly has some connection.

## II.

In the absence of any domestic authority to support the AAU assertion of domestic monopoly jurisdiction, the AAU makes two arguments, both of which are specious.

The first is that there must be only one domestic authority in a particular sport. The AAU suggests that more than one organization in control of track would produce "chaos" and that, therefore, no organizational competition should exist in the promotion of athletic competition. The argument fails for the following reasons:

(a) The history and evolution of track and field in the United States is to the contrary. The AAU failed adequately to develop competition in many areas of the country where it has come about only through efforts of the USTFF. The AAU boycott and reprisal rules created a grass roots revolution which led to the creation of the USTFF. The number of track meets is proliferating by the thousands only as a result of this development. It is a fact beyond serious challenge that continued development of track and field in the United States in the future will remain in the hands of the student-athletes, the institutions and coaches responsible for their training and the organizations to which they belong, i.e., the USTFF constituents. This flood tide of competition will not be stopped by a boycott rule; in fact, the only realistic choice for the AAU is either to join, or at least cooperate with, the organizations creating the competition. In the conduct of track in the U. S. there is room for all the organizations presently promoting competition. With the exception of the AAU, all of them are working well together within the USTFF.

(b) The fact that the IAAF may recognize only one body in each country as its member for *international* purposes is no reason to create or enforce a *domestic* monopoly in the United States for that one member. Domestically, there is no "chaos" in the conduct of the thousands of meets conducted by the USTFF and its constituents and there is no reason why these programs cannot exist peacefully and simultaneously with those of the AAU.

The second AAU argument is that the USOC is somehow a source of authority for the existence of the AAU as a domestic monopoly. There is no basis for such an assertion.

(a) Putting aside the question of the extent to which the AAU controls the U. S. Olympic Committee\* the fact is that USOC "recognition" of the AAU is inevitable so long as the AAU holds membership in the IAAF or other International Federations. The "rec-

\* Mr. Sullivan (AAU counsel) and Mr. Matlin (AAU president) both emphasized that the USOC recently "resoundingly rejected" an application for membership in the USOC on the part of USTFF, with the support of "all the independents," i.e., all other U. S. members of International Sports Federations. The latter part of the statement is untrue. Four of the five USOC officers, three of them representing "independents" voted for admission of the USTFF. The first part of the statement is true, and if the AAU derives satisfaction from the fact let it be their pleasure in a perversion of USOC objectives and constitutional provisions. The classification of USOC membership for which the USTFF was applying carries with it one vote in a body of approximately 3,000 votes, and the USOC constitution requires these qualifications: "Eligible for Group E shall be those national organizations in the United States not members of Groups A, B, C or D, of an athletic, patriotic, educational, cultural, civic or benevolent character desiring to give support to the participation of the United States in the Olympic or Pan-American Games."

ognition" derives from the AAU's Group A membership in the USOC. The USOC rule provides as follows:

"Eligible for Group A shall be those national organizations recognized by the USOC as the national sports governing bodies which are the members in the United States of one or more International Federations recognized by the International Olympic Committee for sports eligible for inclusion in the Olympic Games and administering participation in one or more of the games or competitions upon the Olympic program."

(b) In the hearing there was extended discussion, pursuant to a question from Mr. Metcalfe (Sports Arbitration Board member) as to whether membership in the AAU was a prerequisite to participation in the trials for selection of the U. S. Olympic team. The USOC prescribes the manner of selecting U. S. Olympic teams. In recent Olympiads the procedure for men's track and field has involved a final tryout, into which an athlete qualifies by placing in the first six in his event in the National AAU or NCAA Championships. There are also representatives from the Armed Forces. To the extent the NCAA meet is a part of the trials, obviously AAU membership is not required. The AAU cites USOC General Rule 3-(e): "The special tryouts organized directly or indirectly under authority of each Games Committee shall be open only to amateur athletes who are citizens of the United States eligible under international rules for selection for membership on the United States Olympic or Pan-American Team." We are advised by the Executive Director of the USOC that the USOC Counsellor and Associate Counsellor have ruled that this provision *does not* require membership in the AAU (or another International Federation member according to the sport) for those participating in Olympic trials, and that the Games Committees can defer such registration until after the selection trials; i.e., until embarkation. We understand that this ruling of the Counsellors was confirmed at the last meeting of the USOC Executive Committee.

## III.

Throughout this proceeding, the NCAA has stressed the fact that the AAU sole sanctioning rule and boycott and reprisal practices thereunder are illegal.

The argument that AAU Rule 1-2-(b) is required by IAAF rules is without foundation. There is nothing in the IAAF rules which purports to make any such requirement and, if there were, it would be ineffective. But the AAU only adopted its rule in 1962 after about 70 years of prior existence without it.

Clearly the rule and its enforcement have nothing to do with the AAU's responsibilities to the IAAF but rather are weapons in the AAU's struggle to survive in competition with the USTFF. Unfortunately, the weapons are not only un-American and unsportsmanlike, but also illegal.

As pointed out on the record of several arbitration sessions and as set forth in our May 1, 1967 brief, recent court decisions affecting associations purporting to govern sporting events have held that a boycott is a *per se* violation of Section I of the Sherman Act to the extent that the rules of such an association are designed to have,

or do have, the effect of precluding parties from dealing with others. *Washington State Bowling Proprietors Association v. Pacific Lanes, Inc.*, 356 F.2d 371 (9th Cir. 1966); *People v. Santa Clara Valley Bowling Proprietors Association*, 5 CCH Trade Reg. Rep. (1966 Trade Cases) Para. 71, 639 (California Court of Appeals 1965). In both instances defendants were local bowling proprietors' associations consisting of member bowling alleys, and the challenge was to eligibility rules eliminating from tournaments sponsored by the association bowlers who had participated in tournaments at non-member alleys. In *Pacific Lanes* the court affirmed a jury finding that this was an illegal boycott. It rejected squarely the contention that the *per se* rules established by *Klors v. Broadway-Hale Stores*, 359 U. S. 207 (1959) could not be applied because local bowling proprietors association was a non-commercial organization. It rejected also an argument of reasonableness based on the "interests of bowling." The rules were calculated to restrain competition with the non-member alleys and the supposed abuses could not be used as a defense. In the *Santa Clara* case, defendants modified their eligibility rules so that a minimum amount of participation in member tournaments was a prerequisite to competition in all such tournaments. The modified rule as well was held invalid. Its intent plainly was to compel illegally participation in member tournaments as a means of suppressing competition with non-members. Cf. *Deesen v. PGA*, 358 F.2d 165 (1966) upholding membership rules applying only to PGA's own contests and not used to boycott others'.

The AAU suggestion that amateur sports are exempt from the antitrust laws is without foundation. There is no statutory exemption. The activity is interstate in scope. It involves competitions for which an admission charge is levied on the spectator. It even involves television contracts for some meets. It involves profit or loss for the sponsoring organization.

Furthermore, the right of an individual student-athlete to obtain an injunction against an organization for interfering with his right to compete has been upheld in the recent case of *Ekarid v. Wiberg*, decided July 31, 1967, by the Court of Common Pleas of Clarion County, Pennsylvania. In that case the court said:

"One only has to consider the fabulous amounts that are paid to professional athletes to decide that anything that detracts from the necessary preliminary training is an injury to an athlete. The fact remains that when Wilt Chamberlain receives \$200,000 annually to play basketball and Roberto Clemente and Willie Mays over \$100,000 each annually to play baseball, that Joe Namath received \$400,000 to sign to play professional football and that thousands of boys every year are given scholastic scholarships owing to their athletic ability, that athletics the world over are exceedingly important. The prevention of a student to engage in competitive athletics is also an injury by reason of loss of physical development.

In the present case, plaintiff is maintained by his mother; he has athletic ability to play at least football and basketball. To develop his talents he must have practice, coaching and

competitive training in high school. The prevention of this development most certainly is an injury, and it makes no difference if he may never receive remuneration for playing."

### International Competition and U. S. Participation

The problems relating to selection of competitors and coaches, and the handling of arrangements, for international competition result from (a) the AAU patronage system of rewarding friends and punishing opponents and (b) the fact that the AAU too has virtually nothing to do with most track and field competition in the U. S. and, therefore, lacks the capacities required to do the job well.

The answer is to stop the patronage system and start to make proper use of the organizations which are expert in the field, such as the U. S. Track Coaches Association and other constituents of the USTFF. This requires honest cooperation among all such bodies.

If the Arbitration Board or an arm of it were to try to work this out it could succeed only if the Board first enters a decision which solves the day-to-day problems along the lines discussed in Part I above, i.e., no AAU boycotts or reprisals, no enforcement of any AAU sole sanctioning rule for any domestic meets other than those conducted by AAU for its own members only, full regard by AAU for USTFF as sanctioning agent for its constituents in all meets in which they participate and as a fully capable body for certification of amateurism of their members' competitors, etc.

To date, the AAU has refused to agree to any such reasonable provisions. Thus the right climate for possible agreement on the abovementioned aspects of international competition does not exist. If it did exist as a result of the Board's decision, the opportunity to improve the U. S. performance in all international competition would be tremendous. This could be done without affecting the AAU's franchise from the IAAF.

The AAU need not fear to enter into such cooperation with USTFF. It could be done in such a way as to maintain and guarantee specific AAU responsibilities consistent with its IAAF franchise and with the purpose of using America's track and field resources to the fullest for the best results throughout the world. Such responsibilities would include (a) functions as to U. S. athletes, including determination of amateur status under IAAF Rules 51 and 53, (b) functions as to foreign athletes, other than students, competing in the U. S., (c) the function of sanctioning international meetings as provided in IAAF Rule 10-(4), and (d) normal AAU functions for its own members' competitions.

These functions could be performed consistently with IAAF rules and with a resolution of domestic disputes along the lines outlined above. For example, to carry out function (a), the AAU need only determine that the athlete is an amateur, that he has not knowingly competed in an event in which any of the other competitors were not amateurs, and that he has not engaged in certain forbidden competition outside the United States. To make such determinations the AAU does not have to "sanction" anything. Whether the athlete is an amateur does not depend on whether all the meets he has competed in were "sanctioned" by the AAU. Whether he has knowingly competed in an event against a non-amateur does not

depend on whether the meet or the event was "sanctioned" by the AAU. Whether he has engaged in certain forbidden competition outside the United States does not depend on *anything* which occurs within the United States, much less whether the AAU has "sanctioned" certain meets.

To "recognize" a meeting conducted in the United States [function (b)] the AAU does not have to sanction it. It certainly does not have to sanction it in advance. All it need do is advise the inquiring foreign body that the meeting in question was conducted under the supervision of an organization (such as the USTFF) which the AAU "recognizes" as being responsible.

The convenience of one channel of communication to the IAAF would be maintained without affecting the right of all existing organizations in the U. S. to continue to promote track and field as they see fit. But it would be absolutely mandatory that the AAU not be allowed to use its functions to try to justify power it does not need in order properly to perform those functions or to try to justify AAU interference with the freedom and the rights of the individual American athlete.

### Conclusion

The AAU has killed the moratorium. It has flagrantly defied the prohibition of restraints on participation by any athlete in competition by suspending numerous athletes in both track and gymnastics and by failing to secure Jim Ryun's half-mile record.

The story of the seven Iowa girls suspended for running in a USTFF meet in which Jim Ryun and other men also participated without incurring suspension is a capsule of this whole case. It shows the brutality of the AAU boycott as applied even to little girls about whose amateurism there can be no possible question. It shows the insecurity of the AAU that it resorts to such tactics to try to assert its own power no matter what harm it inflicts on youngsters or what shame it reflects on the United States.

This Arbitration Board can stop such AAU practices and restore freedom of competition to the U. S. If it fails to do so, the USTFF constituents must resort to court action or legislation, or both. This is because in the United States the amateur competitor must be guaranteed freedom of competition and opportunity for self-development—just as the Pennsylvania court said in the *Ekard* case.

The dispute has lasted 50 years. If illegal monopoly practices are allowed to continue, it could last indefinitely. But there is no need for it. The Board can solve the case easily—and the solution will last—if it is based firmly on the rights and the freedom of the individual amateur athlete.

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



1NCAAO00031070

